arXiv:1201.5495v1 [cs.LO] 26 Jan 2012

Tree-Automatic Well-Founded Trees

Alexander Kartzow[1], Jiamou Liu[2], and Markus Lohrey[1, ⋆]

[1] Universität Leipzig, Germany
[2] Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand
kartzow@informatik.uni-leipzig.de, jiamou.liu@aut.ac.nz, lohrey@informatik.uni-leipzig.de

Abstract. We investigate tree-automatic well-founded trees. For this, we introduce a new ordinal measure for well-founded trees, called the embedding rank, briefly erank. The erank of a well-founded tree is always smaller than the ordinary (ordinal) rank of a tree. We also show that the ordinal rank of a well-founded tree of erank α is strictly bounded by $\omega\cdot(\alpha+1)$. For string-automatic well-founded trees, it was shown in [17] that the erank is always finite. Here, using Delhommé's decomposition technique for tree-automatic structures, we show that the erank of a tree-automatic well-founded tree is strictly below ω^ω. As a corollary, we obtain that the ordinal rank of a string-automatic (resp., tree-automatic) well-founded tree is strictly below ω^2 (resp., ω^ω). The result for the string-automatic case nicely contrasts a result of Khoussainov and Minnes, saying that the rank of a string-automatic well-founded partial order reaches all ordinals below ω^ω. As second application of the erank, we show that the isomorphism problem for tree-automatic well-founded trees is complete (under Turing-reductions) for level $\Delta^0_{\omega^\omega}$ of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy.

1 Introduction

Various classes of infinite but finitely presented structures received a lot of attention in algorithmic model theory [3]. Among the most important such classes of structures is the class of *string-automatic structures* [14]. A (relational) structure is string-automatic if its universe is a regular set of words and all relations can be recognized by synchronous multi-tape automata. During the past 15 years a theory of string-automatic structures has emerged. This theory was developed along two interrelated branches. The first is a structural branch, which leads to (partial) characterizations of particular classes of string-automatic structures [8,13,15,16,19]. The second is an algorithmic branch, which leads to numerous decidability and undecidability, as well as complexity results for important algorithmic problems for string-automatic structures [5,18,15]. One of the most fundamental results for string-automatic structures states that their first-order theories are uniformly decidable [14].

By replacing strings and string automata by trees and tree automata, Blumensath [4] generalized string-automatic structures to *tree-automatic structures* and proved that their first-order theories are still uniformly decidable. However compared to string-automatic structures, the theory of tree-automatic structures is less developed. The only non-trivial characterization of a class of tree-automatic structures we are aware of concerns ordinals. Delhommé in [8] proved that an ordinal is tree-automatic if and only if it is strictly below ω^{ω^ω}. Some complexity results for first-order theories of tree-automatic structures are shown in [18]. Recently, Huschenbett proved that it is decidable whether a given tree-automatic scattered linear order is string-automatic [11].

In this paper, we study tree-automatic well-founded trees.[3] Our main tool is a new ordinal measure for well-founded trees, called the embedding rank, briefly erank. The embedding rank of a well-founded tree (denoted erank) is a transfinite extension of the depth of the largest subtree whose inner nodes are all infinitely branching. For instance, if a tree $\mathfrak{T}$ has finite depth, then $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T})$ is the largest number $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{N}^{\leq i}$ can be embedded into $\mathfrak{T}$ (therefore the name embedding rank). This is basically the definition of the erank in [17], where the erank was defined

---

[⋆] The first and third author are supported by the DFG research project GELO.

[3] In this paper the term *tree* always refers to order trees $\mathfrak{T} = (T, \leq)$ as opposed to successor trees, i.e., trees are particular partial orders.

for every tree and by definition it is an ordinal $\leq \omega + 1$. Our definition of the erank can be seen as a transfinite extension of the definition in [17].

The erank of a well-founded tree is always smaller than the ordinary (ordinal) rank of a tree. We also show that the ordinal rank of a well-founded tree of erank α is strictly bounded by $\omega \cdot (\alpha + 1)$. For string-automatic well-founded trees, it was shown in [17] that the erank is always finite. Here, using Delhommé's decomposition technique for tree-automatic structures [8], we show that that the erank of a tree-automatic well-founded tree is strictly below ω^ω. As a corollary, we obtain that the ordinal rank of a string-automatic (resp., tree-automatic) well-founded tree is strictly below ω^2 (resp., ω^ω). The result for the string-automatic case nicely contrasts a result from [13], saying that the ranks of string-automatic well-founded partial orders reach all ordinals below ω^ω.

Our second application of the erank concerns the isomorphism problem for tree-automatic well-founded trees. In [17], it was shown (using the concept of erank) that the isomorphism problem for string-automatic well-founded trees is complete for level Δ^0_ω of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy. In other words, the isomorphism problem for string-automatic well-founded trees is recursively equivalent to true arithmetic. We show that the erank of well-founded computable trees determines the complexity of the isomorphism problem in the following sense: The isomorphism problem for well-founded computable trees of erank at most $\lambda + k$ (where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and λ is a computable limit ordinal) belongs to level $\Sigma^0_{\lambda+3(k+1)}$ of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy. Since we know that the erank of a tree-automatic well-founded tree is strictly below ω^ω, we can use this fact and show that the isomorphism problem for tree-automatic well-founded trees belongs to level $\Delta^0_{\omega^\omega} = \Sigma^0_{\omega^\omega} \cap \Pi^0_{\omega^\omega}$ of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy. We also provide a corresponding lower bound w.r.t. Turing-reductions. Thus, the isomorphism problem for tree-automatic well-founded trees is $\Delta^0_{\omega^\omega}$-complete under Turing-reductions.

Let us remark that for non-well-founded order trees, the isomorphism problem is complete for Σ^1_1 (the first existential level of the analytical hierarchy) already in the string-automatic case [17], and this complexity is in a certain sense maximal, since the isomorphism problem for the class of all computable structures is Σ^1_1-complete as well [7,9]. Let us also emphasize that all our results only hold for order trees, i.e., trees are seen as particular partial orders.

2 Preliminaries

We write $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ for $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. For M, N sets, 2^M denotes the *powerset* of M and N^M denotes the *set of functions* from M to N. By $\bigsqcup_{i \in N} M_i$ we denote the *disjoint union* of the sets $(M_i)_{i \in N}$. For any function f we use $\mathsf{dom}(f)$ to denote the domain of f.

A *relational structure* $\mathfrak{S}$ consists of a *domain* D and atomic relations on the set D. In this paper we will only consider structures with countable domains. Let $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \leq)$ be a partial order. A subset $B \subseteq A$ is a *chain* if for all $a, b \in B$, $a \leq b$ or $b \leq a$. We call a subset $B \subseteq A$ an *antichain* if for all pairwise distinct $a, b \in B$, neither $a \leq b$ nor $b \leq a$. For $B \subseteq A$ we denote with $\mathfrak{A} \restriction_B = (B, \leq \cap (B \times B))$ the restriction of $\mathfrak{A}$ to the set B; it is again a partial order.

Let A be a (not necessarily finite) set. We use $\preceq$ to denote the prefix order on finite words in A^*, i.e., for $u, v \in A^*$, $u \preceq v$ if $v = uw$ for some $w \in A^*$. For a language $L \subseteq A^*$, let $\mathsf{pref}(L) = \{w \in A^* \mid \exists u \in L : w \preceq u\}$ be its *prefix-closure.*

2.1 Trees and forests

A *forest* is a partial order $\mathfrak{F} = (F, \leq)$ where for every $a \in F$ the set $\{b \in F \mid b < a\}$ is a finite chain. A *tree* is a forest which has a smallest element, which is called the *root* of the tree. Note that a forest is a disjoint union of (an arbitrary number of) trees. For a given forest $\mathfrak{F}$, we denote with $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ the tree that results from adding a new root (i.e., a new smallest element) to $\mathfrak{F}$. If F is the domain of $\mathfrak{F}$ we denote with $\langle F \rangle$ the domain of $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$. For a node u in $\mathfrak{F}$, $\mathfrak{F}(u)$ denotes the subtree of $\mathfrak{F}$ at u, i.e., $\mathfrak{F}(u) = \mathfrak{F} \restriction_{\{v \in F \mid v \geq u\}}$. We define the *successor relation* of $\mathfrak{F}$ as $E_{\mathfrak{F}} = \{(x, y) \in F^2 \mid x < y, \neg \exists z : x < z < y\}$. For $x \in F$ the set of *children* of x in $\mathfrak{F}$ is

$E_{\mathfrak{F}}(x) = \{y \in F \mid (x,y) \in E_{\mathfrak{F}}\}$. The set of leaves of $\mathfrak{F}$ is $\mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{F}) = \{x \in F \mid E_{\mathfrak{F}}(x) = \emptyset\}$. A forest $\mathfrak{F} = (F, \leq)$ is *well-founded*, if it does not contain an infinite chain $a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < \cdots$.

Let us now define inductively the classical (ordinal) rank of a well-founded tree as well as the new notion of embedding rank (briefly, erank). We use standard terminology concerning ordinals; see e.g. [21]. For a set of ordinals M, $\sup(M)$ denotes its supremum, where $\sup(\emptyset) = 0$.

Definition 1. *Let $\mathfrak{T}$ be a well-founded tree with root r. We define the* rank *of $\mathfrak{T}$ inductively as*

$$\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) = \sup\{\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}(a)) + 1 \mid a \in E_{\mathfrak{T}}(r)\}.$$

Definition 2. *Let $\mathfrak{T}$ be a well-founded tree with root r. We define the* embedding rank *of $\mathfrak{T}$ as the following ordinal, where $\alpha = \sup\{\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}(a)) \mid a \in E_{\mathfrak{T}}(r)\}$:*

$$\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) = \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{if } \{a \in E_{\mathfrak{T}}(r) \mid \mathsf{erank}(\mathcal{T}(a)) = \alpha\} \text{ is finite,} \\ \alpha + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The erank of a forest $\mathfrak{F}$ (which is not a tree itself) is $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathsf{erank}(\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle)$.

Remark 3. It follows easily from the definition that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = 0$ for every finite forest $\mathfrak{F}$. Conversely, if $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = 0$ then $\mathfrak{F}$ must be finite: By definition $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathsf{erank}(\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle)$. Due to König's Lemma, every finitely branching infinite tree is not well-founded. Thus, if $\mathfrak{F}$ is infinite, $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ has an infinitely branching node a. But then $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}(a)) \geq 1$. By induction on the length from the root of $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ to a, one concludes that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) \geq 1$. More generally, $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = n < \omega$ if and only if there is an embedding of the tree $(\mathbb{N}^{\leq n}, \preceq)$ (the tree of height n where every non-leaf has $\aleph_0$ many children) into $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ but no embedding of $(\mathbb{N}^{\leq n+1}, \preceq)$ into $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$. The latter fact is the reason for the term *embedding* rank.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathfrak{F} = (F, \leq)$ be a well-founded forest. Then, the set $\{a \in F \mid \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}(a)) = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F})\}$ is finite.*

Proof. Let $\alpha = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F})$. It suffices to show that the set $D = \{a \in \langle F \rangle \mid \mathsf{erank}(\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle(a)) = \alpha\}$ is finite. Note that D is a downward-closed subset of the tree $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$. Assume that this set is infinite. Since $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ is well-founded, König's lemma implies that D contains a node a which has infinitely many children a_i ($i \in \mathbb{N}$), which all belong to D. But then $\alpha = \mathsf{erank}(\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle(a)) \geq \alpha + 1$, which is a contradiction. ☐

It is obvious that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) \leq \mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T})$ for every well-founded tree $\mathfrak{T}$ (and $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) \leq \mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{F}) + 1$ for a well-founded forest $\mathfrak{F}$). On the other hand, we can also bound $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T})$ in terms of $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T})$:

Theorem 5. *For a well-founded tree $\mathfrak{T} = (T, \leq)$ we have*

$$\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) < \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) + \omega = \omega \cdot (\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) + 1).$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T})$. It is clear that if T is finite, then $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) = 0$ and $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) \leq |T| < \omega$. Now assume that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) = \alpha$ for some ordinal $\alpha > 0$ such that the theorem holds for all trees of erank strictly below α. By Lemma 4, $T_\alpha = \{t \in T \mid \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}(t)) = \alpha\}$ is a finite and downward-closed subset of T. Let $M_\alpha \subseteq T_\alpha$ be the set of $\leq$-maximal elements of T_α and consider a tree $\mathfrak{T}(a)$ for $a \in M_\alpha$. The definition of M_α implies the following. If $b \in T$ with $b > a$, then $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}(b)) = \beta$ for some ordinal $\beta < \alpha$. By the induction hypothesis it follows that $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}(b)) < \omega \cdot (\beta + 1) \leq \omega \cdot \alpha$. In particular, $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}(b)) < \omega \cdot \alpha$ for all children b of a. Thus, $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}(a)) \leq \omega \cdot \alpha$. Finally, since T_α is a finite set, we have

$$\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) \leq \sup\{\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}(a)) \mid a \in M_\alpha\} + |T_\alpha| \leq \omega \cdot \alpha + |T_\alpha| < \omega \cdot \alpha + \omega = \omega \cdot (\alpha + 1).$$

This proves the lemma. ☐

Note that the upper bound of $\omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) + \omega$ is optimal as for each $n < \omega$, there is a (string-automatic) well-founded tree $\mathfrak{T}_n$ such that $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}_n) = \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}_n) + n$. Let the forest $\mathfrak{F}$ be the disjoint union of finite chains of arbitrary length, and let the tree $\mathfrak{T}_n$ result from the tree $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ by adding a finite chain of length n at the root We can define $\mathfrak{T}_n$ also as $(A, \preceq)$, where $A = \mathsf{pref}(\{0^n i 0^i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*$. We have $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}_n) = \omega + n$ and $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}_n) = 1$.

2.2 Finite labelled trees

A *finite binary tree* is a finite prefix-closed subset $T \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$. Clearly $(T, \preceq)$, where $\preceq$ denotes the prefix relation on $\{0,1\}^*$, is a tree in the above sense. We denote the set of all finite binary trees by $\mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$.

A finite Σ*-labelled* binary tree is a pair (T, λ), where $T \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ and $\lambda : T \to \Sigma$ is a labelling function. With $\mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ we denote the set of all finite Σ-labelled binary trees; elements of $\mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ will be denoted by lower case letters $(s, t, \ldots)$. When Σ is the singleton set $\{\sharp\}$, we will simply consider a tree $t \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ as unlabeled, i.e., $t \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$. The set of leaves of $t = (T, \lambda)$ is $\mathsf{leaves}(t) = \mathsf{leaves}(T, \preceq)$. We define the following operations on labeled trees. For $t = (T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ and $d \in T$ we define the *subtree rooted at* d as $t(d) = (U, \lambda')$, where $U = \{v \in \{0,1\}^* \mid dv \in T\}$ and $\lambda'(v) = \lambda(dv)$ for $v \in U$. For $t_0 = (T_0, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$, $t_1 = (T_1, \lambda_1) \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$, and $d \in T_0$ we denote with $t_0 \circ_d t_1$ the tree obtained from t_0 by replacing $t_0(d)$ with t_1, i.e., $t_0 \circ_d t_1 = (T, \lambda)$ where

$$T = (T_0 \setminus d\{0,1\}^*) \cup dT_1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\lambda(w) = \begin{cases} \lambda_0(w) & \text{if } w \in T_0 \setminus d\{0,1\}^*, \\ \lambda_1(v) & \text{if } w = dv,\ v \in T_1. \end{cases}$$

For $n \geq 1$, $t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_n \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ with $t_0 = (T_0, \lambda_0)$, and an ordered antichain $\bar{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in T_0^n$ (i.e., d_i is not a prefix of d_j for $i \neq j$) we define $t_0 \circ_{\bar{d}} (t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ inductively as

$$t_0 \circ_{\bar{d}} (t_1, \ldots, t_n) = \begin{cases} t \circ_{d_1} t_1 & \text{if } n = 1, \\ (t_0 \circ_{d_1} t_1) \circ_{(d_2, \ldots, d_n)} (t_2, \ldots, t_n) & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

In other words, $t_0 \circ_{\bar{d}} (t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is obtained from t_0 by replacing the subtree at d_i with t_i.

We define the *convolution* $t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_n$ of $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ as follows: Let $t_i = (T_i, \lambda_i)$ where $\lambda_i : T_i \to \Sigma$ and $\diamond \notin \Sigma$. Let $T = \bigcup_{i=1}^n T_i$ and define $\lambda'_i : T \to \Sigma \cup \{\diamond\}$ by

$$\lambda'_i(u) = \begin{cases} \lambda_i(u) & \text{if } u \in T_i \\ \diamond & \text{if } u \in T \setminus T_i \end{cases}$$

Then $t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_n$ is the finite $((\Sigma \cup \{\diamond\})^n \setminus \{(\diamond, \ldots, \diamond)\})$-labelled binary tree (T, λ), where $\lambda : T \to (\Sigma \cup \{\diamond\})^n \setminus \{(\diamond, \ldots, \diamond)\}$ is defined by $\lambda(u) = (\lambda'_1(u), \ldots, \lambda'_n(u))$.

2.3 Tree automata and tree-automatic structures

For $T \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ let

$$\mathsf{cl}(T) = T \cup \{ui \mid u \in T, i \in \{0,1\}\}$$

be the closure of T. Clearly, $\mathsf{cl}(T) \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$

Let Σ be a finite alphabet. A (top-down) *tree automaton over* Σ is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Delta, I, F)$, where Q is the finite set of states, $I \subseteq Q$ is the set of initial states, $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of final states, and $\Delta \subseteq (Q \setminus F) \times \Sigma \times Q \times Q$ is the transition relation. Given a finite Σ-labeled binary tree $t = (T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$, a *successful run* of $\mathcal{A}$ on t is a mapping $\rho : \mathsf{cl}(T) \to Q$ such that (i) $\rho(\varepsilon) \in I$, (ii) $\rho(\mathsf{cl}(T) \setminus T) \subseteq F$, and for every $d \in T$, $(\rho(d), \lambda(d), \rho(d0), \rho(d1)) \in \Delta$. With $L(\mathcal{A})$ we denote the set of all $t \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ on which $\mathcal{A}$ has a successful run. A set $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ is called *regular* if there exists a tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$ over Σ with $L = L(\mathcal{A})$.

We introduce the following auxiliary notation for the (de)composition of successful runs. For $q \in Q$, $\mathcal{A}^q$ denotes the automaton $\mathcal{A}^q = (Q, \Delta, \{q\}, F)$, which is a copy of $\mathcal{A}$ but with q as the unique initial state. Let $t = (T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}_{2,\Sigma}^{\mathsf{fin}}$ and $\bar{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in T^n$ be an ordered antichain in the tree $(T, \preceq)$. Set

$$U_{\bar{d}} = T \setminus \{v \in T \mid \exists 1 \leq i \leq n : d_i \preceq v\}.$$

Note that $U_{\bar{d}}$ is prefix-closed. A $\bar{d}$*-extendable run* of $\mathcal{A}$ on t is a mapping $\rho : \mathsf{cl}(U_{\bar{d}}) \to Q$ such that (i) $\rho(\varepsilon) \in I$, (ii) for every $d \in U_{\bar{d}}$, $(\rho(d), \lambda(d), \rho(d0), \rho(d1)) \in \Delta$ and $\rho(\mathsf{cl}(U_{\bar{d}}) \setminus T) \subseteq F$. Note that there is a successful run of $\mathcal{A}$ on t if and only if there is a $\bar{d}$-extendable run ρ of $\mathcal{A}$ on t such that for each $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ the automaton $\mathcal{A}^{\rho(d_i)}$ accepts the subtree $t(d_i)$.

A successful run ρ of $\mathcal{A}$ on $t = (T,\lambda) \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_{2,\Sigma}$ naturally defines a finite $((\Sigma \times Q \setminus F) \cup F)$-labeled binary tree $\mathsf{tree}(\rho) = (\mathsf{cl}(T),\mu)$ such that $\mu(d) = (\lambda(d),\rho(d))$ for every $d \in T$ and $\mu(d) = \rho(d)$ for every $d \in \mathsf{cl}(T) \setminus T$. With $\mathsf{Run}(\mathcal{A},t)$ we denote the set of all $\mathsf{tree}(\rho)$ where ρ is a successful run of $\mathcal{A}$ on t. Let $\mathsf{Run}(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcup_{t \in L(\mathcal{A})} \mathsf{Run}(\mathcal{A},t)$. This is also a regular set: a tree automaton for $\mathsf{Run}(\mathcal{A})$ can be obtained by replacing every transition $(p,a,p_1,p_2) \in \Delta$ by $(p,(a,p),p_1,p_2)$. For notational simplicity, in the paper we will refer to $\mathsf{tree}(\rho)$ simply as ρ.

From our definition of tree automata it follows immediately that for every tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$ there exists a tree automaton $\mathcal{A}'$ such that $\mathcal{A}'$ has a unique final state and $L(\mathcal{A}) = L(\mathcal{A}')$. But allowing several final states simplifies some constructions in this paper.

An n-ary relation $R \subseteq (\mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_{2,\Sigma})^n$ is called *tree-automatic* if there exists a tree automaton $\mathcal{A}_R$ over $(\Sigma \uplus \{\diamond\})^n \setminus \{(\diamond,\ldots,\diamond)\}$ such that $L(\mathcal{A}_R) = \{t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_n \mid (t_1,\ldots,t_n) \in R\}$. A relational structure $\mathfrak{S}$ is called *tree-automatic* over Σ if its domain is a regular subset of $\mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_{2,\Sigma}$ and each of its atomic relations is tree-automatic; any tuple $\mathbb{P}$ of automata that accept the domain and the relations of $\mathfrak{S}$ is called a *tree-automatic presentation* of $\mathfrak{S}$. In this case, we write $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{P})$ for $\mathfrak{S}$. If a tree-automatic structure $\mathfrak{S}$ is isomorphic to a structure $\mathfrak{S}'$, then $\mathfrak{S}$ is called a *tree-automatic copy* of $\mathfrak{S}'$ and $\mathfrak{S}'$ is *tree-automatically presentable.* In this paper we sometimes abuse the terminology referring to $\mathfrak{S}'$ as simply tree-automatic and calling a tree-automatic presentation of $\mathfrak{S}$ also a tree-automatic presentations of $\mathfrak{S}'$. We also simplify our statements by saying "given/compute a tree-automatic structure $\mathfrak{S}$" for "given/compute a tree-automatic presentation $\mathbb{P}$ of a structure $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{P})$". The structures $(\mathbb{N},+)$ and $(\mathbb{N},\cdot)$ are examples of tree-automatic structures.

A tree-automatic structure over a singleton alphabet (i.e., the domain of the structure is a subset of $\mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_2$) is called *unary tree-automatic.* Moreover, let

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}} = \{t \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_2 \mid \forall u \in t : u0 \in t \Leftrightarrow u1 \in t\}$$

be the set of all finite (unlabeled) full binary trees. We will make use of the following simple lemma.

Lemma 6. *For every tree-automatic structure $\mathfrak{S}$ there exists an isomorphic unary tree-automatic structure $\mathfrak{S}'$, whose domain is a subset of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$. Moreover, there is a computable isomorphism from $\mathfrak{S}$ to $\mathfrak{S}'$, whose inverse is computable too.*

Proof. Let Σ be some finite alphabet; w.l.o.g. assume that $\Sigma = \{1,2,\ldots,n\}$. For $1 \le i \le n$ let $a_i = \mathsf{pref}(\{0,10,110,\ldots,1^{i-1}0,1^i\}) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$. We define an injective mapping $\mathsf{unlabel} : \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_{2,\Sigma} \to \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$ inductively as follows: Let $t = (T,\lambda) \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_{2,\Sigma}$ and for $i \in \{0,1\}$ let $t_i = t(i)$ be the subtree of t rooted at node i, where we set $t_i = \emptyset$ if $i \notin T$. Then

$$\mathsf{unlabel}(t) = \{\varepsilon, 0\} \cup 00\mathsf{unlabel}(t_0) \cup 01\mathsf{unlabel}(t_1) \cup 1a_i,$$

where we set $\mathsf{unlabel}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$. By induction over the size of t it follows easily that the mapping $\mathsf{unlabel}$ is indeed injective. We show that for every tree-automatic relation $R \subseteq (\mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_{2,\Sigma})^k$, the relation

$$\mathsf{unlabel}(R) = \{(\mathsf{unlabel}(t_1),\ldots,\mathsf{unlabel}(t_k)) \mid (t_1,\ldots,t_k) \in R\}$$

is tree-automatic too. Suppose $\mathcal{A} = (Q,\Delta,I,F)$ is a tree automaton recognizing the relation R. We construct a (top-down) tree automaton $\mathcal{A}' = (Q',\Delta',I,F')$ as follows: the state set Q' of $\mathcal{A}'$ contains the set

$$Q \;\cup\; (Q \times Q) \;\cup\; \{\diamond, 1, 2, \ldots, n\}^n$$

(in addition Q' contains some auxiliary states that we do not specify). For a state $q \in Q$, Δ' contains the following transitions (we omit here the unique node label, which formally should be the second component of every transition):

$$(q,(p,r),(x_1,\ldots,x_k)) \text{ if } (q,(x_1,\ldots,x_k),p,r) \in \Delta$$

For a state $(p, r) \in Q \times Q$, Δ' contains the following transitions:

$$((p, r), p, r).$$

Finally, $\mathcal{A}'$ contains additional states Q'' (where $F'' \subseteq Q''$ are new final states) and transitions such that from a state $(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in \{\diamond, 1, 2, \ldots, n\}^n$ only the tree $\mathsf{pref}(s_1 \otimes s_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes s_n)$ with

$$s_i = \begin{cases} a_{x_i} & \text{if } x_i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, \\ \{\varepsilon\} & \text{if } x_i = \diamond. \end{cases}$$

is accepted. Finally we set $F' = F \cup F''$.

Now let $t_1, \ldots, t_k \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_{2,\Sigma}$ and $q \in Q$. A straightforward induction over the size of trees shows that $\mathcal{A}$ accepts $t_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes t_k$ via a run ρ with $\rho(\varepsilon) = q$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}'$ accepts $\mathsf{unlabel}(t_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathsf{unlabel}(t_k)$ via a run ρ' with $\rho'(\varepsilon) = q$.

The above considerations shows that for every tree-automatic structure $\mathfrak{S}$ there exists an isomorphic unary tree-automatic structure $\mathfrak{S}'$, whose domain is a subset of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$. An isomorphism between $\mathfrak{S}$ and $\mathfrak{S}'$ is given by the computable mapping $\mathsf{unlabel}$, whose inverse is computable too. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Consider $\mathsf{FO} + \exists^\infty + \exists^{n,m} + \exists^{\mathsf{chain}}$, the first-order logic extended by the quantifiers $\exists^\infty$ (there exists infinitely many), $\exists^{n,m}$ (there exists finitely many and the exact number is congruent n modulo m, where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$) and the chain-quantifier $\exists^{\mathsf{chain}}$ (if $\varphi(x, y)$ is some formula, then $\exists^{\mathsf{chain}}\varphi(x, y)$ asserts that φ is a partial order and there is an infinite increasing φ-chain). The following theorem from [4,12,22] lays out the main motivation for investigating tree-automatic structures.

Theorem 7. *From a tree-automatic presentation* $\mathbb{P}$ *and a formula* $\varphi(\overline{x}) \in \mathsf{FO}+\exists^\infty+\exists^{n,m}+\exists^{\mathsf{chain}}$ *in the signature of* $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{P})$ *one can compute an automaton whose language consists of those convolutions of tuples* $\overline{t}$ *from* $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{P})$ *that make* φ *true. In particular, the* $\mathsf{FO} + \exists^\infty + \exists^{n,m} + \exists^{\mathsf{chain}}$ *theory of any tree-automatic structure* $\mathfrak{S}$ *is (uniformly) decidable.*

Note that the property of being a tree is expressible in $\mathsf{FO} + \exists^\infty$. Moreover the chain-quantifier allows one to define well-foundedness of a tree. Hence, we get:

Corollary 8. *The class of tree-automatic well-founded trees is decidable.*

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a class of tree-automatic presentations. The *isomorphism problem* $\mathrm{Iso}(\mathcal{K})$ is the set of pairs $(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{K}$ of tree-automatic presentations with $\mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{P}_1) \cong \mathfrak{S}(\mathbb{P}_2)$. If $\mathcal{K}$ is the class of tree-automatic presentations for a class $\mathcal{C}$ of relational structures (e.g. trees), then we will briefly speak of the isomorphism problem for (tree-automatic members of) $\mathcal{C}$. The isomorphism problem for the class of all tree-automatic structures is complete for Σ^1_1, the first level of the analytical hierarchy; this holds already for string-automatic trees [15,17].

2.4 Hyperarithmetical sets

We use standard terminology concerning recursion theory; see e.g. [20]. We use the definition of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy from Ash and Knight [2], see also [10]. We first define inductively a set of *ordinal notations* $O \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Simultaneously we define a mapping $a \mapsto |a|_O$ from O into ordinals and a strict partial order $<_O$ on O. The set O is the smallest subset of $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- $1 \in O$ and $|1|_O = 0$, i.e., 1 is a notation for the ordinal 0.
- If $a \in O$, then also $2^a \in O$. We set $|2^a|_O = |a|_O + 1$ and let $b <_O 2^a$ if and only if $b = a$ or $b <_O a$.
- If $e \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that Φ_e (the e^{th} partial computable function) is total, $\Phi_e(n) \in O$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\Phi_e(0) <_O \Phi_e(1)_O <_O \Phi_e(2) <_O \cdots$, then also $3 \cdot 5^e \in O$. We set $|3 \cdot 5^e|_O = \sup\{|\Phi_e(n)|_O \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and let $b <_O 3 \cdot 5^e$ if and only if there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $b <_O \Phi_e(n)$.

An ordinal α is *computable* if there exists $a \in O$ with $|a|_O = \alpha$. The smallest non-computable ordinal is the Church-Kleene ordinal ω_1^{ck}. If $a \in O$ then the restriction of the partial order $(O, <_O)$ to $B = \{b \in O \mid b <_O a\}$ is isomorphic to the ordinal $|a|_O$ [2, Prop. 4.9]. Moreover, the set B is computably enumerable and an index for B can be computed from a [2, Prop. 4.10].

Next, we define the *hyperarithmetical hierarchy* based on ordinal notations. For this we define sets $H(a)$ for each $a \in O$ as follows:

- $H(1) = \emptyset$,
- $H(2^b) = H(b)'$ (the Turing jump of $H(b)$; see e.g. [20]),
- $H(3 \cdot 5^e) = \{\langle b, n\rangle \mid b <_O 3 \cdot 5^e, n \in H(b)\}$; here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes a computable pairing function.

Spector has shown that $|a|_O = |b|_O$ implies that $H(a)$ and $H(b)$ are Turing equivalent. The levels of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy can be defined as follows, where α is a computable ordinal.

- Σ^0_α is the set of all subsets $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ that are recursively enumerable in some $H(a)$ with $|a|_O = \alpha$ (by Spector's theorem, the concrete choice of a is irrelevant).
- Π^0_α is the set of all complements of Σ^0_α-sets.
- $\Delta^0_\alpha = \Sigma^0_\alpha \cap \Pi^0_\alpha$, i.e., Δ^0_α is the set of all subsets $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ that are Turing-reducible to some $H(a)$ with $|a|_O = \alpha$.

A relation $R \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$ is X^0_α (with $X \in \{\Sigma, \Pi, \Delta\}$) if the set $\{\langle x_1, \ldots, x_k\rangle \mid (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in R\}$ is X^0_α, where $\langle \cdot, \ldots, \cdot \rangle$ denotes a computable encoding of k-tuples.

For any two computable ordinals α, β, $\alpha < \beta$ implies $\Sigma_\alpha \cup \Pi_\alpha \subsetneq \Delta_\beta$. The union of all classes Σ^0_α where $\alpha < \omega_0^{\mathsf{ck}}$ yields the class of all *hyperarithmetical sets*. By a classical result of Kleene, the hyperarithmetical sets are exactly the sets in $\Delta^1_1 = \Sigma^1_1 \cap \Pi^1_1$, where Σ^1_1 is the first existential level of the analytical hierarchy, and Π^1_1 is the set of all complements of Σ^1_1-sets.

For our purpose, it is convenient to present an alternative definition of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy using computable infinitary formulas. Fix a predicate $R(\overline{x}) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$ where $k \geq 1$. If R is computable, then a Σ^0_0 (resp. Π^0_0) *index* for R is a triple $(\Sigma, 0, e)$ (resp. $(\Pi, 0, e)$) where e is an index for R. Next, let $0 < \alpha < \omega_1^{\mathsf{ck}}$ be a computable ordinal.

Case 1. $\alpha = \beta + 1$ is a successor ordinal. Then, a Σ^0_α (resp. Π^0_α) index for R is a triple (Σ, a, e) (resp. (Π, a, e)) where $|a|_O = \alpha$ and e is a Π^0_β (resp. Σ^0_β) index for a predicate $P(\overline{x}, y) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{k+1}$ such that for all $\overline{x} \in \mathbb{N}^k$:

$$R(\overline{x}) \Leftrightarrow \exists y : P(\overline{x}, y) \qquad \Big(\text{resp. } R(\overline{x}) \Leftrightarrow \forall y : P(\overline{x}, y)\Big).$$

Case 2. α is a limit ordinal. Then, a Σ^0_α (resp. Π^0_α) index for R is a triple (Σ, a, e) (resp. (Π, a, e)), where $|a|_O = \alpha$ and Φ_e is a total computable function such that the following holds: For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Phi_e(n)$ is a $\Pi^0_{\beta_n}$ (resp. $\Sigma^0_{\beta_n}$) index for some predicate $P_n(\overline{x}) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$, $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \ldots < \alpha$ with $\sup\{\beta_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \alpha$, and for all $\overline{x} \in \mathbb{N}^k$:

$$R(\overline{x}) \Leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{N}} P_i(\overline{x}) \qquad \Big(\text{resp. } R(\overline{x}) \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{N}} P_i(\overline{x})\Big).$$

Essentially, we can view a Σ^0_α (resp. Π^0_α) index as a finite representation of a *computable infinitary formula* that defines the corresponding Σ^0_α (resp. Π^0_α) predicate. For instance, the Σ^0_α index (Σ, a, e), where $|a|_O$ is a limit ordinal, represents the computable infinitary formula $\bigvee_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi_i$, where φ_i is the computable infinitary formula represented by the index $\Phi_e(n)$. In this paper we will use the notions of Σ^0_α (resp. Π^0_α) predicates and indices interchangeably. Formally, we do not allow negation in computable infinitary formula. But if $\varphi(\overline{x})$ defines the Σ^0_α (resp. Π^0_α) set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}^k$, then one can construct effectively a Π^0_α (resp. Σ^0_α) formula for $\mathbb{N}^k \setminus A$; and we therefore may define this formula as $\neg\varphi(\overline{x})$, see [2, Theorem 7.1].

3 Bounding the erank of tree-automatic well-founded trees

We show in this section that the erank of a tree-automatic well-founded tree is strictly below ω^ω. The first part of our proof relies on Delhommé's decomposition result for tree-automatic structures [8]. Delhommé's main proposition shows that for a given tree-automatic structure $\mathfrak{B}$ and a given tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$ all substructures induced by $\mathcal{A}$ (via different trees as parameter) are composed from a finite set of structures $\mathcal{C}$ using the operations of box-augmentation and sum-augmentation. Roughly speaking, a structure $\mathfrak{B}$ is a sum-augmentation of structures $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n$ if there is a partition of the domain of $\mathfrak{B}$ such that this partition induces the substructures $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n$ (see Def. 9). The structure $\mathfrak{B}$ is a box-augmentation of $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n$ if its domain is the product of the domains of $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n$ such that fixing all but the i^{th} component of this product arbitrarily results in a structure isomorphic to $\mathfrak{B}_i$ (see Def. 14).

Let ν be a function that maps structures to some set M. We say that an element $m \in M$ is ν-indecomposable if for all $\mathfrak{B}$ and all sum- or box-augmentations of $\mathfrak{B}$ via structures $\mathfrak{B}_1, \mathfrak{B}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n$, $\nu(\mathfrak{B}) = m$ implies that $\nu(\mathfrak{B}_i) = m$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ (see Def. 26). Delhommé's result implies that the substructures of a tree-automatic structure $\mathfrak{B}$ defined by a fixed tree-automaton $\mathcal{A}$ only take finitely many ν-indecomposable values. Unfortunately, Delhommé never published a proof of this result. Since our further arguments rely on this proof, we reprove his result in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. More precisely, we strengthen his result by proving that one only has to consider ν-indecomposability with respect to box-augmentations that are *tamely colorable*. Roughly speaking, $\mathfrak{B}$ is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n)$ if there are finite colorings of the $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and a simple rule how to reconstruct $\mathfrak{B}$ completely from the $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and these colorings.

In Section 3.3, we prove that the erank of any tree-automatic well-founded tree is bounded by ω^ω. We prove this result using erank-indecomposability (with respect to tamely colorable box-augmentations): We can prove that all ordinals of the form ω^α are erank-indecomposable. Thus, there are infinitely many erank-indecomposable ordinals below ω^ω. Since all subtrees of a given tree-automatic tree are definable by an automaton $\mathcal{A}$ and since a tree of erank α contains subtrees of erank β for all $\beta \leq \alpha$, we conclude that no tree-automatic well-founded tree has erank ω^ω.

Note that Delhommé's original result is too weak for our proof. Using the definition of erank-indecomposable values with respect to all box-augmentations, the ordinals 0 and 1 are the only erank-indecomposable values. The problem is that any forest containing an infinite antichain is the box-augmentation of two infinite antichains. Note that an infinite antichain has erank 1. Hence, ordinals above 1 are not erank-indecomposable with respect to Delhommé's original definiton.

3.1 Delhommé's decomposition result for tree-automatic structures

In this section we prove a result claimed in [8] (but no proof was provided there). In fact, we present a stronger claim which was developed in joint work with Martin Huschenbett. We concentrate on the case of tree-automatic graphs.[4] Let us fix a tree-automatic graph $\mathfrak{A} = (A, <)$ and an automaton $\mathcal{A}_<$ with state set $Q_<$ that recognizes $<$. By Lemma 6, we can assume that $A \subseteq \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{A}$ is defined over a unary alphabet. We fix an automaton $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ accepts a subset of

$$A \otimes \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}} = \{t \otimes s \mid t \in A, s \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}\}.$$

Let $Q_\mathcal{A}$ denote the states of $\mathcal{A}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that for any tree there is at most one successful run of $\mathcal{A}_<$ and $\mathcal{A}$, respectively (i.e., we assume that the automata are bottom-up deterministic).

For a tree $s \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ define the induced substructure

$$\mathfrak{A}_s = \mathfrak{A}{\restriction}_{\{t \in A \mid t \otimes s \in L(\mathcal{A})\}}.$$

---

[4] Since we focus on forests in subsequent sections, we write $<$ for the edge-relation symbol. The proofs in this section are easily extended to a finite number of relations of arbitrary arities.

Note that $\mathfrak{A}_s$ is also tree-automatic. In the first step of our proof we analyze the induced substructures of $\mathfrak{A}$ defined by $\mathcal{A}$, i.e., the class

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A},\mathcal{A}) = \{\mathfrak{A}_s \mid s \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}\}. \tag{1}$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A},\mathcal{A})$ only contains tree-automatic structures. We reprove Delhommé's result that there is a finite set of tree-automatic structures such that all structures in $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A},\mathcal{A})$ are composed from this finite set via the operations of *sum-augmentation* and *box-augmentation.* Moreover, we show that the occurring box-augmentations are what we call *tamely colorable.*

In the following we assume that the domain of a structure $\mathfrak{B}$ is the set B and similarly B_i is the domain of $\mathfrak{B}_i$ and A_s that of $\mathfrak{A}_s$ etc.

3.1.1 Sum-augmentations of tree-automatic structures

Definition 9. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of structures and $\mathfrak{B}$ a structure. We say $\mathfrak{B}$ is a sum-augmentation of $\mathcal{C}$ if there is a finite tuple $(\mathfrak{B}_1, \mathfrak{B}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n) \in \mathcal{C}^n$ such that there is a bijection*

$$\eta : \bigsqcup_{1\leq i\leq n} B_i \to B$$

such that $\eta{\restriction}_{B_i}$ is an isomorphic embedding of $\mathfrak{B}_i$ into $\mathfrak{B}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, i.e., $\mathfrak{B}_i \cong \mathfrak{B}{\restriction}_{\eta(B_i)}$.

We prove that for all $s \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ the substructure $\mathfrak{A}_s$ is the sum-augmentation of certain structures which we call *Delhommé components.*

Definition 10. *For $s, t \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$, we define $t_s = t \cap \mathsf{cl}(s) \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$. An* extension node *of t with respect to s is an element of $\mathsf{leaves}(t_s) \setminus s$.*

In the following we say "$\bar{d} = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$ are the extension nodes of t with respect to s" and mean that $\bar{d}$ contains all extension nodes of t with respect to s in lexicographic order.

For each $s \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ we associate with every $t \in A_s$ a type that characterizes its behavior with respect to $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_<$.

Definition 11. *Let $s, t \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ such that $t \otimes s \in L(\mathcal{A})$, i.e., $t \in A_s$. Let ρ be the unique (successful) run of the automaton $\mathcal{A}$ on $t \otimes s$. Let $\bar{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ be the extension nodes of t with respect to s. The* type of t (with respect to s) *is defined by*

$$\mathsf{type}_s(t) = (n, \bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{Q}_<, \bar{P}_<) \in \mathbb{N} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}}^n \times \left(2^{Q_<}\right)^n \times 2^{(Q_<^n)} \text{ where}$$

- *$\bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}} = (\rho(d_1), \rho(d_2), \dots, \rho(d_n))$,*
- *$\bar{Q}_< = (Q_{<,1}, Q_{<,2}, \dots, Q_{<,n})$ where $Q_{<,i} = \{q \in Q_< \mid \mathcal{A}_<^q$ accepts $t(d_i) \otimes t(d_i)\}$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and*
- *$\bar{P}_<$ contains those tuples $(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)$ for which there is a $\bar{d}$-extendable run ρ' of $\mathcal{A}_<$ on $t_s \otimes t_s$ such that $\rho'(d_i) = q_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

If s is clear from the context, we omit the subscript s and write type instead of type_s. For a fixed tree s, the number of extension nodes of a tree t is bound by $2 \cdot |\mathsf{leaves}(s)|$, hence the range of type_s is finite.

Next we introduce a specific type of sum-augmentations for the structure $\mathfrak{A}_s$ for each tree s. The components of these sum-augmentations are defined via a refinement of the equal-type_s-equivalence.

Definition 12. *For trees $t, t' \in A_s$ we say that t and t' are* s-component-equivalent*, denoted by $t \equiv_s t'$, if $\mathsf{type}(t) = \mathsf{type}(t')$ and $t_s = t'_s$. For each $t \in A_s$, we call $[t]_s = \mathfrak{A}_s{\restriction}_{\{t' \in A_s \mid t' \equiv_s t\}}$ the* Delhommé component of t in $\mathfrak{A}_s$*.*

Since the range of type_s is finite for any fixed s, and the set $\{t_s \mid t \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}\}$ is finite, the equivalence relation $\equiv_s$ has finite index. Hence, the following lemma holds.

Lemma 13. *For each tree s, $\mathfrak{A}_s$ is a sum-augmentation of its Delhommé components.*

3.1.2 Box-augmentations of Delhommé components

Definition 14. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a class of structures and $\mathfrak{B}$ a structure. We say that $\mathfrak{B}$ is a box-augmentation of $\mathcal{C}$ if there is a finite tuple $(\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n) \in \mathcal{C}^n$ and a bijection $\eta : \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_i \to B$ such that for each $1 \leq k \leq n$, for all $\bar{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_{k-1}) \in \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} B_i$ and all $\bar{d}' = (d_{k+1}, \dots, d_n) \in \prod_{i=k+1}^{n} B_i$ the mapping $\eta_k^{\bar{d}\bar{d}'} : \mathfrak{B}_k \to \mathfrak{B}$ with*

$$\eta_k^{\bar{d}\bar{d}'}(e) = \eta(d_1, \dots d_{k-1}, e, d_{k+1}, \dots d_n)$$

is an embedding of $\mathfrak{B}_k$ into $\mathfrak{B}$.

In order to obtain an improved version of Delhommé's result, we need the notion of *tamely colorable* box-augmentations.

Definition 15. *Let $\mathfrak{B} = (B, <)$ and $\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n$ be structures, and let $\eta : \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} B_i \to B$ be a bijection witnessing that $\mathfrak{B}$ is a box-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_n)$. We say that $\mathfrak{B}$ is* tamely colorable *if there are*

- *finite colorings $\varphi_i : B_i \times B_i \to C_i$ (with $|C_i| < \infty$) for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and*
- *a map $\varphi_{\mathfrak{B}} : \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} C_i \to \{0, 1\}$ such that for all $b, b' \in \mathfrak{B}$, we have $b < b'$ if and only if for $(b_1, \dots, b_n) = \eta^{-1}(b)$ and $(b'_1, \dots, b'_n) = \eta^{-1}(b')$ we have $\varphi_{\mathfrak{B}}(\varphi_1(b_1, b'_1), \dots, \varphi_n(b_n, b'_n)) = 1$.*

The second condition says that the mapping $\varphi_{\mathfrak{B}}$ and the colorings of the pairs of the "componentwise preimages" of b and b' determine whether $b < b'$.

The goal of this section is to prove that there is a finite set $\mathcal{C}$ of tree-automatic structures, which we call *Delhommé lines*, such that for every tree s the Delhommé components of $\mathfrak{A}_s$ are tamely colorable box-augmentations of $\mathcal{C}$. A Delhommé line is the substructure of a Delhommé component $[t]_s$ which is obtained by restriction to those trees of $[t]_s$ which are obtained by replacing the subtree rooted at a fixed extension node d of t in the tree t.

Definition 16. *Let $s, t \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ and let d_i be the i^{th} extension node of t with respect to s. We call $[t]_s^i = [t]_s{\restriction}_{\{u \in [t]_s \mid \exists v : u = t \circ_{d_i} v\}}$ a* Delhommé line*.*

Remark 17. If t does not have extension nodes with respect to s, then $t_s = t$ and $t \subseteq s$. Hence, $[t]_s$ is the one element structure only containing t.

In order to prove that there are only finitely many Delhommé lines (up to isomorphism) with respect to a fixed tree-automatic graph and the fixed automaton $\mathcal{A}$, we introduce the notion of the *i-line type* of a node t (with respect to s). We then show that this type characterizes $[t]_s^i$ up to isomorphism. In the following definition, we denote the projection on the i^{th} coordinate as π_i.

Definition 18. *Let s be a tree and $t \in A_s$. Assume that $\mathsf{type}_s(t) = (n, \bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{Q}_<, \bar{P}_<)$. Set*

$$P_i = \{\pi_i(\bar{p}) \mid \bar{p} \in \bar{P}_<, \forall k \neq i : \pi_k(\bar{p}) \in \pi_k(\bar{Q}_<)\} \subseteq Q_<.$$

Then the line-i-type of t *with respect to s is $\mathsf{type}_s^i(t) = (\pi_i(\bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}}), \pi_i(\bar{Q}_<), P_i)$.*

Remark 19. Note that $\mathsf{type}_s^i(t) = \mathsf{type}_s^i(u)$ for all $u \in [t]_s^i$: If $u \in [t]_s^i \subseteq [t]_s$ then $\mathsf{type}_s(t) = \mathsf{type}_s(u)$, which implies $\mathsf{type}_s^i(t) = \mathsf{type}_s^i(u)$.

Lemma 20. *Let $\mathsf{type}_s^i(t) = (q, Q, P)$. A tree $t \circ_{d_i} v$ is in $[t]_s^i$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}^q$ accepts $v \otimes \emptyset$ and $Q = \{p \in Q_< \mid \mathcal{A}_<^p$ accepts $v \otimes v\}$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} t \circ_{d_i} v \in [t]_s^i &\overset{\text{Def. 16}}{\iff} t \circ_{d_i} v \in [t]_s \\ &\overset{\text{Def. 12}}{\iff} \mathsf{type}(t \circ_{d_i} v) = \mathsf{type}(t) \text{ and } (t \circ_{d_i} v)_s = t_s \\ &\iff \mathsf{type}(t \circ_{d_i} v) = \mathsf{type}(t) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $\mathsf{type}_s^i(t) = (q, Q, P)$, we have $\mathsf{type}(t \circ_{d_i} v) = \mathsf{type}(t)$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}^q$ accepts $v \otimes \emptyset$ and $Q = \{p \in Q_< \mid \mathcal{A}_<^p$ accepts $v \otimes v\}$. □

Lemma 21. *Let $s, s' \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$, $t \in A_s$, and $t' \in A_{s'}$. Let d_i (resp. e_j) be the i^{th} (resp. j^{th}) extension node of t (resp. t') with respect to s (resp. s'). If $\mathsf{type}_s^i(t) = \mathsf{type}_{s'}^j(t')$ then there is an isomorphism $\eta : [t]_s^i \to [t']_{s'}^j$ mapping $u = t \circ_{d_i} u' \in [t]_s^i$ to $t' \circ_{e_j} u' \in [t']_{s'}^j$.*

Proof. From Lemma 20, it follows immediately that η is a bijection between $[t]_s^i$ and $[t']_{s'}^j$. We show that η is an isomorphism. Let $\mathsf{type}_s^i(t) = (q, P, Q)$. Let u', v' be trees such that $u = t \circ_{d_i} u'$ and $v = t \circ_{d_i} v'$ are elements of $[t]_s^i$. We have $u < v$ if and only if there is $q \in P$ such that $\mathcal{A}_<^q$ accepts $u' \otimes v'$. Since $\mathsf{type}_s^i(t) = \mathsf{type}_{s'}^j(t')$ this happens if and only if $\eta(u) = t' \circ_{e_j} u' < t' \circ_{e_j} v' = \eta(v)$. ☐

Corollary 22. *There are only finitely many Delhommé lines up to isomorphism.*

Now we are prepared to show that each Delhommé component is a one element structure or it is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of its Delhommé lines.

Lemma 23. *Let $[t]_s$ be a Delhommé component. Either $[t]_s$ is a one element structure or $[t]_s$ is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of its Delhommé lines $([t]_s^1, \ldots, [t]_s^n)$, where n is the number of extension nodes of t.*

Remark 24. Over a fixed finite signature, there are only finitely many one element structures. Moreover, if $[t]_s$ is a one element structure then it is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of $([t]_s)$. Hence, the lemma claims that every Delhommé component is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of structures from the finite set of Delhommé lines and of one element structures.

Proof. If t does not have any extension node with respect to s, then $[t]_s$ contains only one element. Assume that t has $n \geq 1$ extension nodes. We first define a bijection $\eta : \prod_{i=1}^n [t]_s^i \to [t]_s$. We then show that it induces the required embeddings of each $[t]_s^i$ in $[t]_s$ for all tuples of parameters from the Delhommé lines $[t]_s^1, \ldots, [t]_s^{i-1}, [t]_s^{i+1}, \ldots, [t]_s^n$. Let $\bar{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ be the extension nodes of t. We claim that the function $\eta : \prod_{i=1}^n [t]_s^i \to \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ with

$$\eta(t \circ_{d_1} u_1, t \circ_{d_2} u_2, \ldots, t \circ_{d_n} u_n) = t \circ_{\bar{d}} (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n)$$

maps into $[t]_s$.

Let us fix trees $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ such that $t \circ_{d_i} u_i \in [t]_s^i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and let

$$\mathsf{type}_s(t) = (n, \bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{Q}_<, \bar{P}_<).$$

Since $t \circ_{d_i} u_i \equiv_s t$, we have

$$\mathsf{type}_s(t \circ_{d_i} u_i) = \mathsf{type}_s(t) = (n, \bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{Q}_<, \bar{P}_<).$$

Consider the tree

$$t' = \eta(t \circ_{d_1} u_1, \ldots, t \circ_{d_n} u_n) = t \circ_{\bar{d}} (u_1, \ldots, u_n)$$

and let $\mathsf{type}_s(t') = (n', \bar{q}'_{\mathcal{A}}, \bar{Q}'_<, \bar{P}'_<)$. It is clear that $t'_s = t_s$. Thus, η maps into $[t]_s$ if and only if it preserves the type, i.e., if $\mathsf{type}_s(t') = \mathsf{type}_s(t)$. We immediately get $n = n'$. Since $t \circ_{d_i} u_i$ belongs to $[t]_s^i$, Lemma 20 implies the following:

(1) There is a successful run ρ_i of $\mathcal{A}^{\pi_i(\bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}})}$ on $u_i \otimes \emptyset$.
(2) $\pi_i(\bar{Q}_<) = \{q \in Q_< \mid \mathcal{A}_<^q \text{ accepts } u_i \otimes u_i\}$

Let ρ denote the unique successful run of $\mathcal{A}$ on $t \otimes s$. By definition of $\mathsf{type}_s(t)$, $\rho(d_i) = \pi_i(\bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}})$. Hence, $\rho \circ_{\bar{d}} (\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n)$ is a successful run on $t' = t \circ_{\bar{d}} (u_1 \ldots u_n)$. Thus, $\bar{q}_{\mathcal{A}} = \bar{q}'_{\mathcal{A}}$. Since $t'(d_i) = u_i$, point (2) above implies $\bar{Q}'_< = \bar{Q}_<$. Finally, since $\bar{P}_<$ only depends on t_s and since $\bar{P}'_<$ only depends on t'_s, we obtain $\bar{P}_< = \bar{P}'_<$ because of $t_s = t'_s$. Thus, $\mathsf{type}_s(t') = \mathsf{type}_s(t)$ and η indeed maps into $[t]_s$. Essentially the same argument shows that η is surjective. Moreover, η is clearly injective and therefore a bijection.

For $1 \leq i \leq n$ let $N_i = \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\}$. We have to show that for each $\bar{u} = (u_j)_{j \in N_i}$ such that $t \circ_{d_j} u_j \in [t]^j_s$ for all $j \in N_i$, the map $\eta^{\bar{u}}_i : [t]^i_s \to [t]_s$ with

$$\eta^{\bar{u}}_i(t \circ_{d_i} u_i) = t \circ_{\bar{d}} (u_1, \dots, u_n)$$

is an embedding. Consider $u = t \circ_{d_i} v \in [t]^i_s$ and $u' = t \circ_{d_i} v' \in [t]^i_s$. It holds that $u < u'$ if and only if there is a $\bar{d}$-extendable run ρ of $\mathcal{A}_<$ on $u_s \otimes u'_s = t_s \otimes t_s$ (thus $(\rho(d_1), \dots, \rho(d_n)) \in \bar{P}_<$) such that $\rho(d_j) \in \pi_j(\bar{Q}_<)$ for every $j \in N_i$ and $v \otimes v'$ is accepted by $\mathcal{A}^{\rho(d_i)}_<$. Since $\eta^{\bar{u}}_i(u)_s = \eta^{\bar{u}}_i(u')_s = u_s = u'_s = t_s$ and since the types of u, u', $\eta^{\bar{u}}_i(u)$, and $\eta^{\bar{u}}_i(u')$ agree, these conditions are equivalent to $\eta^{\bar{u}}_i(u) < \eta^{\bar{u}}_i(u')$. Thus, $\eta^{\bar{u}}_i$ is indeed an embedding.

Finally, we show that the box-augmentation is tamely colorable. We define a coloring on $[t]^i_s$ as follows. Set $\varphi_i : [t]^i_s \times [t]^i_s \to 2^{Q_<}$, where

$$\varphi_i(t \circ_{d_i} u_i, t \circ_{d_i} v_i) = \{q \mid \mathcal{A}^q_< \text{ accepts } u_i \otimes v_i\}.$$

Recall that the convolution $(t \circ_{\bar{d}} (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)) \otimes (t \circ_{\bar{d}} (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n))$ of elements from $[t]_s$ is accepted by $\mathcal{A}_<$ if and only if $\mathcal{A}_<$ has a $\bar{d}$-extendable run ρ on $t_s \otimes t_s$ such that for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ the automaton $\mathcal{A}^{\rho(d_i)}_<$ accepts the subtree $u_i \otimes v_i$. The latter condition is equivalent to $\rho(d_i) \in \varphi_i(t \circ_{d_i} u_i, t \circ_{d_i} v_i)$. Thus, the colors $\varphi_i(t \circ_{d_i} u_i, t \circ_{d_i} v_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ determine whether $t \circ_{\bar{d}} (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n) < t \circ_{\bar{d}} (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)$ holds. Hence, $[t]_s$ is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of its Delhommé lines. □

The main result of this section is summarized in the following proposition, which follows directly from Lemmas 13, 23 and Corollary 22.

Proposition 25. *Given a tree-automatic structure* $\mathfrak{A}$ *with domain* $A \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_2$ *and an automaton* $\mathcal{A}$ *with* $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq A \otimes \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_2$*, there is a finite set of (tree-automatic) structures* $\mathcal{D}$ *such that for all* $s \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_2$ *the substructure* $\mathfrak{A}_s$ *is a sum-augmentation of tamely colorable box-augmentations of* $\mathcal{D}$*.*

3.2 Sum- and box-indecomposability

We call a class of structures $\mathcal{C}$ *substructure-closed* if for each $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ and every subset B of the domain of $\mathfrak{A}$, also $\mathfrak{A} \restriction_B \in \mathcal{C}$. We call a function $\nu : \mathcal{C} \to N$ where N is arbitrary and $\mathcal{C}$ is a class of structures *isomorphism-invariant* if for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{C}$, $\nu(\mathfrak{A}) = \nu(\mathfrak{B})$ whenever $\mathfrak{A} \cong \mathfrak{B}$.

Definition 26. *Let* $\nu : \mathcal{C} \to N$ *be an isomorphism-invariant function with a substructure-closed domain* $\mathcal{C}$*, and let* $n \in N$*.*

1. n *is* ν-sum-indecomposable *if for all structures* $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_m \in \mathcal{C}$ *such that* $\nu(\mathfrak{A}) = n$ *and* $\mathfrak{A}$ *is a sum-augmentation of* $(\mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_m)$*, there is* $1 \leq i \leq m$ *such that* $\nu(\mathfrak{A}_i) = n$*.*
2. n *is* ν-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable *if for all structures* $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_m \in \mathcal{C}$ *such that* $\nu(\mathfrak{A}) = n$ *and* $\mathfrak{A}$ *is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of* $(\mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_m)$*, there is* $1 \leq i \leq m$ *such that* $\nu(\mathfrak{A}_i) = n$*.*

Remark 27. In the definition it would suffice to require that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ because if $\mathfrak{A}$ is a box- or sum-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_m)$, then each $\mathfrak{A}_i$ occurs as an induced substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is substructure-closed, this already implies that $\mathfrak{A}_i \in \mathcal{C}$.

The decomposition results from the previous sections imply that ν may only take finitely many ν-sum-indecomposable and ν-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable values among the substructures from $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{A})$ (defined in (1) at the beginning of Section 3.1) for a fixed tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 28. *Let* $\nu : \mathcal{C} \to N$ *be an isomorphism-invariant function with a substructure-closed domain* $\mathcal{C}$*, and let* $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ *be tree-automatic with domain* $A \subseteq \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_2$*. Furthermore, let* $\mathcal{A}$ *be some tree automaton with* $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq A \otimes \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_2$*. The set* $\nu(\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{A}))$ *contains only finitely many values that are both* ν*-sum-indecomposable and* ν*-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable.*

Proof. Heading for a contradiction, assume that $(s_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of trees such that $\nu(\mathfrak{A}_{s_i}) = n_i$ are pairwise distinct ν-sum-indecomposable and ν-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable values.

Due to Proposition 25, there exists a finite set $\mathcal{D}$ of structures such that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{A}_s$ is a sum-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{A}^1_{s_i}, \dots, \mathfrak{A}^{k_i}_{s_i})$, where every $\mathfrak{A}^j_{s_i}$ is a tamely colorable box-augmentations of structures from $\mathcal{D}$. Due to the definition of ν-sum-indecomposability, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $1 \leq j_i \leq k_i$ such that $\nu(\mathfrak{A}^{j_i}_{s_i}) = n_i$. The structure $\mathfrak{A}^{j_i}_{s_i}$ is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of structures from the finite set $\mathcal{D}$. By definition of ν-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposability, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a structure $\mathfrak{B}_i \in \mathcal{D}$, which occurs in the box-augmentation of $\mathfrak{A}^{j_i}_{s_i}$, such that $\nu(\mathfrak{B}_i) = n_i$. Thus, $(\mathfrak{B}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an infinite sequence in $\mathcal{D}$ and its elements have pairwise distinct ν-values. But this contradicts the finiteness of $\mathcal{D}$. □

For the sake of completeness of reproving Delhommé's result, we restate his main result. We call a value n *ν-box-indecomposable* if for all structures $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_m \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\nu(\mathfrak{A}) = n$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ is a box-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{A}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{A}_m)$, there is $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $\nu(\mathfrak{A}_i) = n$.

Corollary 29. *Let $\nu : \mathcal{C} \to N$ be an isomorphism-invariant function with a substructure-closed domain $\mathcal{C}$, let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ be tree-automatic with domain $A \subseteq \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be some tree automaton with $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq A \otimes \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$. The set $\nu(S(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{A}))$ contains only finitely many values that are both ν-sum- and ν-box-indecomposable.*

3.3 The embedding rank of well-founded tree-automatic trees

In this section, we show that all ordinals of the form ω^α are erank-sum-indecomposable and erank-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable. Note that this is wrong if we replace erank-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposability by the notion of erank-box-indecomposability as defined in at the end of the previous section. More precisely, there are no erank-box-indecomposable values greater than 1: Every infinite forest $\mathfrak{F}'$ is embeddable into some forest $\mathfrak{F}$ which is a box-augmentation of two infinite antichains and that has the same erank, i.e., $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}')$. Thus, $\mathfrak{F}$ is a box-augmentation of two forests of erank 1. Hence, if $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \alpha > 1$, then α is not erank-box-indecomposable.

Fix a tree-automatic well-founded forest $\mathfrak{F}$. The formula $\varphi(x, y) = (y \leq x)$ induces an automaton $\mathcal{A}$ that defines depending on the second parameter all subtrees of $\mathfrak{F}$. We show that for each $\alpha < \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F})$ there is a subtree of erank α. Proposition 28 then implies that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F})$ is bounded by some ω^i with $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, all tree-automatic well-founded trees have erank strictly below ω^ω.

In order to bound the erank of all tree-automatic well-founded trees by ω^ω, it suffices to find infinitely many simultaneously erank-sum- and erank-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable values below ω^ω. We first prove that ω^α is erank-sum-indecomposable for each ordinal α in Section 3.3.1. In Section 3.3.2, we then show that ω^α is erank-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable for all ordinals α.

As an auxiliary step, we prove that erank is a monotone function with respect to induced substructures. Let us write $\mathfrak{F}_1 \leq \mathfrak{F}_2$ if the forest $\mathfrak{F}_1$ is an induced substructure of the forest $\mathfrak{F}_2$.

Lemma 30. *For $\mathfrak{F}_1 \leq \mathfrak{F}_2$ well-founded forests, we have $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2)$.*

Proof. The case $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2) = 0$ is trivial, since $\mathfrak{F}_2$ and therefore also $\mathfrak{F}_1$ must be finite.

Assume that the lemma is true for all well-founded forests $\mathfrak{F}'_1, \mathfrak{F}'_2$ with $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}'_2) < \alpha$ for some ordinal $\alpha > 0$. Furthermore, assume that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2) = \alpha$. It suffices to show that $\mathsf{erank}(\langle\mathfrak{F}_1\rangle) \leq \alpha$ for all $\mathfrak{F}_1 \leq \mathfrak{F}_2$.

Lemma 4 and $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2) = \alpha$ imply that the set

$$F_2^\alpha = \{a \in F_2 \mid \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2(a)) \geq \alpha\} = \{a \in F_2 \mid \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2(a)) = \alpha\}$$

is finite. Heading for a contradiction, assume that $\mathfrak{F}_1 \leq \mathfrak{F}_2$ is such that $\mathsf{erank}(\langle\mathfrak{F}_1\rangle) = \beta > \alpha$. By definition of erank, there are infinitely many nodes $a \in F_1$ with $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1(a)) \geq \alpha$. By finiteness of F_2^α, this implies that there is some $a \in F_1$ such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1(a)) \geq \alpha$ and $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2(a)) < \alpha$. But then the induction hypothesis implies $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1(a)) < \alpha$ which is a contradiction. □

3.3.1 erank-sum-indecomposable values. The goal of this section is to prove that the ordinals of the form ω^α are erank-sum-indecomposable for all ordinals α.

In order to prove that ω^α is erank-sum-indecomposable, we show that erank satisfies a triangle-inequality with respect to the natural sum $\oplus$. The natural sum of two ordinals α and β is the largest linearization of the disjoint union of α and β (cf. [1]). It is commutative and satisfies $\alpha \oplus \beta < \alpha \oplus \gamma$ if and only if $\beta < \gamma$. Furthermore,

$$\alpha \oplus \beta = \omega^\gamma \text{ implies } \alpha = \omega^\gamma \text{ or } \beta = \omega^\gamma. \tag{2}$$

We next show that for every partition $F = F_1 \uplus F_2$ of the domain of a forest $\mathfrak{F}$, we have $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F} \upharpoonright_{F_1}) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F} \upharpoonright_{F_2})$. Together with the previous remark, this implies that ω^α is erank-sum-indecomposable for all ordinals α.

Lemma 31. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a well-founded forest and $F = F_1 \uplus F_2$ a partition of the domain of $\mathfrak{F}$. Let $\mathfrak{F}_i = \mathfrak{F} \upharpoonright_{F_i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Then* $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2)$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F})$. For $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = 0$ the claim is trivial. Assume now that the lemma holds for all forest of erank less than $\alpha > 0$.

Case 1. $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \alpha = \beta + 1$ is a successor ordinal. Let F^α be the set of all nodes of the tree $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ that have erank α. Since $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \alpha$, F^α is nonempty, finite (by Lemma 4), and downward-closed. Let $\mathfrak{F}^\alpha = \langle F \rangle \upharpoonright_{F^\alpha}$. By definition, there is a leaf a in $\mathfrak{F}^\alpha$ such that among the children of a in $\langle F \rangle$ there is a sequence $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in F^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}(a_i)) = \beta$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, let $\mathfrak{F}^i_j = \mathfrak{F}(a_i) \upharpoonright_{F_j}$. Due to the induction hypothesis we have

$$\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^i_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^i_2) \geq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}(a_i)) = \beta. \tag{3}$$

We distinguish two subcases.

Case 1.1. There are $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^j_1) < \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^k_1)$. Since $\mathfrak{F}_1 \geq \mathfrak{F}^k_1$ and $\mathfrak{F}_2 \geq \mathfrak{F}^j_2$, and due to monotonicity of erank (Lemma 30) and $\oplus$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2) &\geq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^k_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^j_2) \\
&> \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^j_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^j_2) \\
&\overset{(3)}{\geq} \beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2) \geq \beta + 1 = \alpha = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F})$. If there are $j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^j_2) < \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^k_2)$, then we can argue analogously.

Case 1.2. There are ordinals α_1, α_2 such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^i_1) = \alpha_1$ and $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^i_2) = \alpha_2$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, there must be $j \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $a_i \in F_j$ for infinitely many $i \in \mathbb{N}$. W.l.o.g. assume that there is an infinite set $M \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_i \in F_1$ for all $i \in M$. Note that $\mathfrak{F}^i_1$ is a tree (of erank α_1) for all $i \in M$. With Lemma 30 we get $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) \geq \mathsf{erank}(\bigcup_{i \in M} \mathfrak{F}^i_1) = \alpha_1 + 1$ (where for the last equality it is important that all $\mathfrak{F}^i_1$ $(i \in M)$ are trees). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2) &\geq (\alpha_1 + 1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^1_2) \\
&= (\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^1_1) + 1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^1_2) \\
&\geq (\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^1_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^1_2)) + 1 \\
&\overset{(3)}{\geq} \beta + 1 = \alpha = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}).
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \alpha$ is a limit ordinal. Then for each $\beta < \alpha$ there is a node $a_\beta \in F$ such that $\beta \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}(a_\beta)) < \alpha$. Let $\mathfrak{F}^\beta_i = \mathfrak{F}(a_\beta) \upharpoonright_{F_i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. By induction hypothesis, $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^\beta_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^\beta_2) \geq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}(a_\beta))$. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_2) &\geq \sup\{\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^\beta_1) \mid \beta < \alpha\} \oplus \sup\{\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^\beta_2) \mid \beta < \alpha\} \\
&\geq \sup\{\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^\beta_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}^\beta_2) \mid \beta < \alpha\} \\
&\overset{\text{IH}}{\geq} \sup\{\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}(a_\beta)) \mid \beta < \alpha\} \\
&= \alpha = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 32. *If* $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \omega^\alpha$ *and* $\mathfrak{F}$ *is a sum-augmentation of* $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \mathfrak{F}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{F}_n)$*, then there is some* $1 \leq i \leq n$ *such that* $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_i) = \omega^\alpha$*.*

Proof. If $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) < \omega^\alpha$ and $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F} \restriction_{F \setminus F_1}) < \omega^\alpha$, then

$$\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) \overset{\text{Lemma 31}}{\leq} \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F} \restriction_{F \setminus F_1}) < \omega^\alpha$$

where the last inequality follows from property (2) of $\oplus$. We conclude that either $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) = \omega^\alpha$ or $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F} \restriction_{F \setminus F_1}) = \omega^\alpha$. The claim follows by induction on n. □

Corollary 33. *The ordinals of the form* ω^α *are* erank*-sum-indecomposable.*

3.3.2 erank-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable values.

In the previous section we have shown that ω^α is erank-sum-indecomposable. We now head for the result that ω^α is also erank-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable for $\alpha > 0$. We start with the observation that every box-decomposition of a forest does only contain at most one proper forest in the sense that if a forest is a box-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \mathfrak{F}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{F}_n)$ then all but one of the $\mathfrak{F}_i$ are only disjoint unions of chains. In order to prove this fact, we introduce the following notation. Let $\mathfrak{F} = (F, \leq)$ be some forest. We call $a \in F$ a *branching node (of* $\mathfrak{F}$*)*, if there are $b, c \in F$ such that $a < b$, $a < c$ and neither $b \leq c$ nor $c \leq b$ (i.e., b and c are incomparable).

Lemma 34. *Let* $\mathfrak{F}$*,* $\mathfrak{F}_1$*, and* $\mathfrak{F}_2$ *be forests. If* $\mathfrak{F}$ *is a box-augmentation of* $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \mathfrak{F}_2)$ *then* $\mathfrak{F}_1$ *or* $\mathfrak{F}_2$ *does not contain a branching node.*

Proof. Heading for a contradiction assume that $a_i, b_i, c_i \in F_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ are nodes such that $a_i < b_i, a_i < c_i$ and neither $b_i \leq c_i$ nor $c_i \leq b_i$.

Let $\eta : F_1 \times F_2 \to F$ be the bijection that witnesses that $\mathfrak{F}$ is a box-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \mathfrak{F}_2)$. Then $\mathfrak{F}$ contains the chains

$$\eta(a_1, a_2) < \eta(b_1, a_2) < \eta(b_1, b_2) \text{ and}$$
$$\eta(a_1, a_2) < \eta(a_1, b_2) < \eta(b_1, b_2).$$

Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a forest, the predecessors of $\eta(b_1, b_2)$ are linearly ordered and we may assume that $\eta(a_1, b_2) < \eta(b_1, a_2)$ without loss of generality. Thus, we obtain

$$\eta(a_1, a_2) < \eta(a_1, b_2) < \eta(b_1, a_2) < \eta(b_1, c_2).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\eta(a_1, a_2) < \eta(a_1, c_2) < \eta(b_1, c_2).$$

Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a forest, the predecessors of $\eta(b_1, c_2)$ form a chain and we obtain $\eta(a_1, c_2) * \eta(a_1, b_2)$ for some $* \in \{<, >\}$. By definition of the embedding $\eta_2^{a_1}$ we obtain $c_2 * b_2$ which contradicts the incomparability of these two nodes in $\mathfrak{F}_2$. Thus, we conclude that $\mathfrak{F}_1$ or $\mathfrak{F}_2$ does not contain a branching node. □

Corollary 35. *Let* $\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{F}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{F}_n$ *be forests such that* $\mathfrak{F}$ *is a box-augmentation of* $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{F}_n)$*. There is at most one* $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ *such that* $\mathfrak{F}_i$ *contains a branching node, i.e., there is an* $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ *such that* $\mathfrak{F}_k$ *is a disjoint union of chains for all* $k \neq i$*.*

Proof. Let $\eta : \prod_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{F}_i \to \mathfrak{F}$ be the bijection of the box-augmentation. Choose $1 \leq j < k \leq n$ and $\bar{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_{j-1}, b_{j+1}, \ldots, b_{k-1}, b_{k+1}, \ldots, b_n) \in \prod_{i \in \{1, \ldots n\} \setminus \{j,k\}} F_i$ arbitrarily but fixed. Then $\eta_{j,k}^{\bar{b}} : F_j \times F_k \to F$ with $\eta_{j,k}^{\bar{b}}(b_j, b_k) = \eta(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ induces a box-augmentation of some subforest $\mathfrak{F}' \leq \mathfrak{F}$. An application of Lemma 34 yields the claim. □

The following lemmas characterize the erank of a forest that is a box-augmentation of one tree with a tuple of chains.

Lemma 36. *If* $\mathfrak{C}$ *is the disjoint union of finite chains, then* $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{C}) \leq 1$.

Proof. Every finite chain has erank 0 by definition. Thus, if $\mathfrak{C}$ consists of infinitely many finite chains then $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{C}) = 1$. Otherwise $\mathfrak{C}$ is finite and hence $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{C}) = 0$. □

Lemma 37. *Let* $\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{F}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{F}_m$ *be forests such that* $\mathfrak{F}$ *is a box-augmentation of* $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{F}_m)$ *via* $\eta : \prod_{i=1}^{m} \mathfrak{F}_i \to \mathfrak{F}$. *Let* I_i *be a chain of length* n_i *in* F_i. *The subforest* $\mathfrak{F}' \leq \mathfrak{F}$ *induced by* $\eta(\prod_{i=1}^{m} I_i)$ *is a chain of length* $n_1 \cdot n_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot n_m$.

Proof. We have to show that any two elements of $\mathfrak{F}'$ are comparable. Let $a_i \in I_i$ be arbitrary and $b_i \in I_i$ be the maximal element in I_i. Then

$$\eta(a_1, \ldots, a_m) \leq \eta(b_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m) \leq \eta(b_1, b_2, a_3, \ldots, a_m) \leq \cdots \leq \eta(b_1, \ldots, b_m).$$

Thus, all elements of $\mathfrak{F}'$ are ancestors of $\eta(b_1, \ldots, b_m)$. Since $\mathfrak{F}'$ is a forest, they form a chain. □

Lemma 38. *Let* $\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{F}_1$ *be well-founded forests and* $\mathfrak{C}_2, \mathfrak{C}_3, \ldots, \mathfrak{C}_m$ *disjoint unions of finite chains such that* $\mathfrak{F}$ *is a box-augmentation of* $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \mathfrak{C}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{C}_m)$ *via* $\eta : F_1 \times \prod_{i=2}^{m} C_i \to F$. *Let* $T_1 \subseteq F_1$ *induce a tree* $\mathfrak{T}_1$ *and* $I_j \subseteq C_j$ *a finite chain of length* n_j *for each* $2 \leq j \leq m$. *The subforest* $\mathfrak{F}'$ *induced by* $\eta(T_1 \times \prod_{i=2}^{m} I_i)$ *is* $\mathfrak{T}_1$ *where each node is replaced by a finite chain of length* $n_2 \cdots n_m$.

Proof. Let a_i (resp. b_i) be minimal (resp. maximal) in I_i for $2 \leq i \leq m$. If $\mathfrak{T}_1$ is a chain the result follows from Lemma 37. Otherwise, we proceed by induction on the branching structure of the well-founded tree $\mathfrak{T}_1$.

We show that for all $t, t_0, t_1 \in T_1$ such that t_0 and t_1 are incomparable and $t < t_0, t < t_1$, it holds that $\eta(t, b_2, \ldots, b_m) < \eta(t_i, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ for $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Since t_0 and t_1 are incomparable, also $\eta(t_0, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ and $\eta(t_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ are incomparable due to the definition of a box-augmentation. It is clear that $\eta(t, b_2, \ldots, b_m) < \eta(t_i, b_2, \ldots, b_m)$ and $\eta(t_i, a_2, \ldots, a_m) < \eta(t_i, b_2, \ldots, b_m)$ for $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a forest, the predecessors of $\eta(t_i, b_2, \ldots, b_m)$ are linearly ordered. Hence $\eta(t, b_2, \ldots, b_m)$ and $\eta(t_i, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ are comparable for $i \in \{0, 1\}$. It cannot occur that $\eta(t_0, a_2, \ldots, a_m) < \eta(t, b_2, \ldots, b_m) < \eta(t_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ because the first and the last element of this chain are incomparable. Moreover, since $\eta(t_0, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ and $\eta(t_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ are incomparable, we cannot have $\eta(t_i, a_2, \ldots, a_m) < \eta(t, b_2, \ldots, b_m)$ for $i = 1$ and $i = 2$. Thus, we must have $\eta(t, b_2, \ldots, b_m) < \eta(t_i, a_2, \ldots, a_m)$ for $i = 1$ and $i = 2$.

By induction on the branching structure of $\mathfrak{T}_1$ it follows that $\mathfrak{F}'$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{T}_1$ where we replace every node by a finite chain of length $n_2 \cdots n_m$. □

Corollary 39. *Let* $\mathfrak{C}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{C}_m$ *be finite chains,* $\mathfrak{T}$ *a well-founded tree and* $\mathfrak{F}$ *a well-founded forest. If* $\mathfrak{F}$ *is a box-augmentation of* $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{C}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{C}_m)$ *then* $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T})$.

Proof. The result follows from Lemma 38 by setting $\mathfrak{T}_1 = \mathfrak{F}_1$ and $I_j = \mathfrak{C}_j$ in Lemma 38. Note that replacing nodes by finite chains in a tree does not change the erank. □

Having dealt with box-augmentations of chains, we now focus on box-augmentations of antichains. As said before we have to restrict our attention to tamely colorable box-augmentations. If a forest $\mathfrak{F}$ is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of n antichains then the depth of each tree in $\mathfrak{F}$ is bounded by some constant that only depends on the tame colorings of the antichains and on n. For the proof of this fact we use the following corollary of Ramsey's theorem.

Lemma 40. *Let* Γ *be a finite set of size* $n \geq 1$. *There is a constant* $h_n \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that the following holds. Let* $\mathfrak{A} = (A, \leq)$ *be some partial order. Assume that* $< = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} R_\gamma$ *is the disjoint union of relations* R_γ *(each* R_γ *need not be transitive). If* A *contains a chain* C *of length* h_n, *then there exists* $\gamma \in \Gamma$ *and* $c_1 < c_2 < c_3 \in C$ *such that* $(c_i, c_j) \in R_\gamma$ *for* $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$

Lemma 41. *Let* $\mathfrak{F} = (F, \leq)$ *be a well-founded forest that is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of forests* $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \mathfrak{F}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{F}_n)$*. Let* $\eta : \prod_{i=1}^{n} F_i \to F$ *denote the bijection corresponding to this box-augmentation. There is a constant c such that the following holds: For all choices of antichains* $A_i \subseteq F_i$ *(for each* $1 \leq i \leq n$*), the substructure of* $\mathfrak{F}$ *induced by* $\eta(\prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i)$ *does not contain a chain of length c.*

Proof. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, fix a coloring

$$\varphi_i : F_i \times F_i \to C_i$$

of the pairs of $\mathfrak{F}_i$ and a function

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{F}} : \prod_{i=1}^{n} C_i \to \{0, 1\}$$

which witness that $\mathfrak{F}$ is a tamely colorable box-augmentation. Moreover, set $\Gamma = \prod_{i=1}^{n} C_i$. We decompose $\leq = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} R_\gamma$ as follows. For $f, f' \in F$ with $f \leq f'$ and $\gamma = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$, let $(f, f') \in R_\gamma$ if there are $f_1, f_1' \in F_1, \dots, f_n, f_n' \in F_n$ such that

- $f = \eta(f_1, \dots, f_n)$,
- $f' = \eta(f_1', \dots, f_n')$, and
- $\varphi_i(f_i, f_i') = c_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Now set $c = h_{|\Gamma|}$ as defined in Lemma 40.

Heading for a contradiction, assume that there is a chain of length c in $\eta(\prod_{i=1}^{n} A_i)$ for $A_i \subseteq F_i$ an antichain. By Lemma 40 there exist $\gamma = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \Gamma$ and three elements $f^1 < f^2 < f^3$ in this chain such that

$$f^i R_\gamma f^j \text{ for } 1 \leq i < j \leq 3.$$

By definition of a box-augmentation there are elements f_j^i for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that

$$\eta(f_1^i, \dots, f_n^i) = f^i \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq 3.$$

We defined R_γ in such a way that

$$\varphi_j(f_j^1, f_j^3) = \varphi_j(f_j^2, f_j^3) = c_j \text{ for each } 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

Moeover, since $f^1 \leq f^3$, we have

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{F}}(c_1, \dots, c_n) = 1$$

Thus,

$$\varphi_{\mathfrak{F}}\left(\varphi_1(f_1^2, f_1^3), \varphi_2(f_2^1, f_2^3), \dots, \varphi_n(f_n^1, f_n^3)\right) = \varphi_{\mathfrak{F}}(c_1, \dots, c_n) = 1.$$

Due to the definition of a tamely colorable box-augmentation this implies

$$f' := \eta(f_1^2, f_2^1, \dots, f_n^1) \leq \eta(f_1^3, f_2^3, \dots, f_n^3) = f^3.$$

Since the elements below f^3 are linearly ordered, we conclude that f' and $f^1 = \eta(f_1^1, f_2^1, \dots, f_n^1)$ are comparable. Recall that $\eta(\cdot, f_2^1, \dots f_n^1)$ embeds $\mathfrak{F}_1$ into $\mathfrak{F}$. We conclude that f_1^1 and f_1^2 are also comparable in $\mathfrak{F}_1$. Since A_1 is an antichain, $f_1^1 \in A_1$ and $f_1^2 \in A_1$ imply $f_1^1 = f_1^2$. Analogous arguments for the other coordinates show that $f_i^1 = f_i^2$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$. Hence $f^1 = f^2$ contradicting $f^1 < f^2$. ☐

For α some ordinal and $c \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote as $\alpha \otimes c$ the c-fold natural sum of α, i.e., $\alpha \otimes 1 = \alpha$ and $\alpha \otimes (n+1) = (\alpha \otimes n) \oplus \alpha$. Combining the previous lemma with Lemma 38, we obtain the following bound for the erank of a Delhommé component in terms of the eranks of its Delhommé lines.

Proposition 42. *Let $\mathfrak{F} = (F, \leq)$ be some well-founded forest that is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of forests $\mathfrak{F}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{F}_n$. There is a constant c such that*

$$\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) \leq ((\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_j) + 1) \otimes c) + 1$$

for some $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Proof. Let η denote the bijection of the tamely colorable box-augmentation of $\mathfrak{F}$. Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a forest, Corollary 35 implies that at most one $\mathfrak{F}_j$ is not a disjoint union of chains. Let R_i be the sets of roots of $\mathfrak{F}_i$. For $r \in R_i$ we denote by $\mathfrak{T}_r$ (a tree) the connected component of r in $\mathfrak{F}_i$. Let $r_i \in R_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\bar{r} = (r_1, \ldots, r_n)$. Due to Lemma 38, $\eta(\prod_{i=1}^n T_{r_i})$ is a tree with root $\eta(\bar{r})$ in $\mathfrak{F}$. We denote this tree by $\mathfrak{T}_{\bar{r}}$. Let $\mathfrak{A} = \bigcup_{\bar{r} \in R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n} \mathfrak{T}_{\bar{r}}$ be the disjoint union of all such trees $\mathfrak{T}_{\bar{r}}$. Thus, $\mathfrak{F}$ is obtained from $\mathfrak{A}$ by adding certain edges connecting different trees of $\mathfrak{A}$.

Let $\bar{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \prod_{i=1}^n F_i$ and $\bar{b} \in \prod_{i=1}^n F_i$ such that $\eta(\bar{a})$ and $\eta(\bar{b})$ belong to different components $\mathfrak{T}_{\bar{q}}$ and $\mathfrak{T}_{\bar{r}}$, $\bar{q} \neq \bar{r}$, such that $\eta(\bar{a}) < \eta(\bar{b})$. Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a forest, the nodes below $\eta(\bar{b})$ are comparable. Hence without loss of generality $\eta(\bar{q}) < \eta(\bar{r})$. Thus, nodes from different components of $\mathfrak{A}$ are comparable only if the corresponding roots are comparable.

Note that R_i is an antichain in $\mathfrak{F}_i$. By Lemma 41 there is a constant c such that there are no chains of length c in $\eta(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n)$. Let $\mathfrak{T}$ be a maximal connected component of $\mathfrak{F}$, i.e., some tree in $\mathfrak{F}$. For each chain $\mathfrak{C}$ (with domain C) in $\mathfrak{T}$, we have $|C \cap \eta(R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n)| \leq c$. Thus, we can partition the domain T of $\mathfrak{T}$ as $T = M_1 \cup \cdots \cup M_d$ with $d \leq c$, where $a \in T$ belongs to M_i if and only if a belongs to the component $\mathfrak{T}_{\bar{r}}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\eta(\bar{r})$ is the i^{th} root of $\mathfrak{A}$ occurring in the chain from the root of $\mathfrak{T}$ to a. Note that $\eta(\bar{r})$ must belong to this chain since $\eta(\bar{r}) \leq d$. Let $\mathfrak{M}_i$ be the substructure of $\mathfrak{T}$ induced by M_i.

Clearly, $\mathfrak{T}$ is a sum-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{M}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{M}_c)$. Furthermore, every $\mathfrak{M}_i$ is a disjoint union of trees $(\mathfrak{T}_{\bar{r}})_{\bar{r} \in N_i}$ for certain sets $N_i \subseteq R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n$, i.e., $\mathfrak{M}_i$ is a subforest of $\mathfrak{A}$. To see this, assume that there are $a \in \mathfrak{T}_{\bar{q}}$, $b \in \mathfrak{T}_{\bar{r}}$ with $\bar{q}, \bar{r} \in N_i$, $\bar{q} \neq \bar{r}$, and a and b are comparable in $\mathfrak{M}_i \leq \mathfrak{T}$. By the above observation, this implies that the roots $\eta(\bar{q})$ and $\eta(\bar{r})$ are comparable. One the other hand, the definition of M_i implies that $\eta(\bar{q})$ and $\eta(\bar{r})$ are the i^{th} roots of $\mathfrak{A}$ on certain chains in the tree $\mathfrak{T}$, which implies that they are not comparable.

Due to Corollary 39, there is $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that all trees in $\mathfrak{A}$ have erank at most $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_j)$. Thus, $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{M}_i) \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_j) + 1$. Due to Lemma 31,

$$\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{M}_1) \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{M}_2) \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{M}_c) \leq (\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_j) + 1) \otimes c.$$

Since this bound is independent of the choice of $\mathfrak{T}$, each tree in the forest $\mathfrak{F}$ has erank at most $(\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_j) + 1) \otimes c$. But this directly implies that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) \leq ((\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_j) + 1) \otimes c) + 1$. ☐

Corollary 43. *For every ordinal α, the ordinal ω^α is simultaneously* erank*-sum-indecomposable and* erank*-tamely-colorable-box-indecomposable.*

Proof. We proved the erank-sum-indecomposability of ω^α in Lemma 33. Now assume that $\mathfrak{F}$ is a well-founded forest which is a tamely colorable box-augmentation of $(\mathfrak{F}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{F}_n)$. and that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_i) < \omega^\alpha$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Without loss of generality assume that the erank of $\mathfrak{F}_1$ is maximal among the $\mathfrak{F}_i$. There are natural numbers $n_1, n_2, \ldots n_k$ and ordinals $\alpha > \alpha_1 > \cdots > \alpha_k$ such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) = \omega^{\alpha_1} \cdot n_1 + \cdots + \omega^{\alpha_k} \cdot n_k$ (write $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1)$ in Cantor normal form).

By Proposition 42 there is a number $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) \leq ((\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_1) + 1) \otimes c) + 1 = \omega^{\alpha_1} \cdot (n_1 \cdot c) + \cdots + \omega^{\alpha_k} \cdot (n_k \cdot c) + c + 1 < \omega^\alpha.$$

Thus, if $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}) = \omega^\alpha$, then one of the $\mathfrak{F}_i$ has also erank at least ω^α. Since erank is monotone and $\mathfrak{F}_i$ is embedabble into $\mathfrak{F}$, $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}_i) = \omega^\alpha$ which completes the proof. ☐

Corollary 44. *If $\mathfrak{T}$ is a tree-automatic well-founded tree, then* $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) < \omega^\omega$.

Proof. Take an automaton $\mathcal{A}$ for the first-order formula $\varphi(x,y) = (y \leq x)$. The class $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{T},\mathcal{A}) = \{\mathfrak{T}_s \mid s \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}\}$ is the class of all subtrees of $\mathfrak{T}$. We claim that for each ordinal α with $\alpha \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T})$, there is a $\mathfrak{T}' \in \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{T},\mathcal{A})$ with $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}') = \alpha$.

Let s be the root of $\mathfrak{T}$. We iterate the following process: assume that $\mathfrak{T}_s$ is a tree of erank at least α. If $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}_s) = \alpha$ then $\mathfrak{T}_s$ witnesses the claim. Otherwise, $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}_s) > \alpha$ and we can choose an ordinal β with $\alpha \leq \beta < \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}_s)$. There must be a node $s' > s$ such that $\beta \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}_{s'}) < \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}_s)$. Continue with s' instead of s. Since $\mathfrak{T}$ is well-founded, this process terminates after finitely many iterations. But this can only be the case, if we have obtained a subtree of erank α.

Due to Proposition 28, and Corollary 43, this implies that there are finitely many ordinals γ such that $\omega^\gamma \leq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T})$. Hence, for every tree-automatic well-founded tree, there is some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) \leq \omega^i$. ☐

Theorem 5, Corollary 44, and the results from [17] on the eranks of string-automatic trees imply the following bounds on the (ordinary) ranks of string- and tree-automatic trees.

Corollary 45. *For $\mathfrak{T} = (T,\leq)$ a string-automatic (tree-automatic, respectively) well-founded order tree we have $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) < \omega^2$ ($\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) < \omega^\omega$, respectively).*

Proof. For a string-automatic well-founded tree $\mathfrak{T}$, $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T})$ is finite by [17]. Due to Theorem 5,

$$\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) \leq \omega \cdot i < \omega^2$$

for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For a tree-automatic well-founded tree $\mathfrak{T}$, we have $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) < \omega^\omega$ by Corollary 44. Thus, there is some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T}) \leq \omega^i$. Then

$$\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) < \omega \cdot \omega^i + \omega = \omega^{i+1} + \omega < \omega^\omega.$$

follows from Theorem 5.

Note that the above result contrasts with results on the ranks of string-automatic well-founded partial orders. Khoussainov and Minnes proved that the ordinal ranks of string-automatic well-founded partial orders are the ordinals strictly below ω^ω (where the ordinal rank is generalized to all well-founded partial orders in the natural way, see Appendix B) [13]. Moreover, Delhommé's characterization of tree-automatic ordinals yields tree-automatic well-founded partial orders of ordinal rank α for each $\alpha < \omega^{\omega^\omega}$ [8].

A well-founded forest is a partial order such that neither the ordinal ω nor its reverse ω^* can be embedded. One might conjecture that this property is the reason for the smaller ranks of well-founded string-automatic forests ($< \omega^2$) in comparison to the class of all well-founded string-automatic partial orders ($< \omega^\omega$). But this intuition is wrong. In Appendix B we construct for each ordinal $\alpha < \omega^\omega$ a string-automatic partial order $\mathfrak{P}$ such that (i) neither ω nor ω^* can be embedded into $\mathfrak{P}$, and (ii) $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}) \geq \alpha$. The same question for the tree-automatic case is open:

Question 46. Given $\omega^\omega \leq \alpha < \omega^{\omega^\omega}$, is there a tree-automatic partial order $\mathfrak{P}$ of rank (or erank) α such that neither ω nor ω^* can be embedded into $\mathfrak{P}$?

4 Upper bound for the isomorphism problem for well-founded trees

It turns out that the erank for well-founded computable trees yields an upper bound on the recursion-theoretic complexity of the isomorphism problem. Recall that we defined forests as particular partial orders. For the isomorphism problem, it is useful to assume that also the direct successor relation is computable. When speaking of a computable forest in the following theorem, we mean a forest $\mathfrak{F} = (F,\leq)$ such that F, $\leq$, and the direct successor relation $E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ are all computable.[5] Note that the direct successor relation of a tree-automatic forest is even tree-automatic, since it is first-order definable.

---

[5] On the other hand, if we would omit the requirement of a computable direct successor relation in Theorem 47, then we would only have to replace the constant 2 in the theorem by a larger value.

Theorem 47. *Let α be a computable ordinal and assume that $\alpha = \lambda + k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and either $\lambda = 0$ or λ is a limit ordinal. The isomorphism problem for well-founded computable trees of erank at most α belongs to level $\Sigma^0_{\lambda+2(k+1)}$ of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy.*

Proof. Let us fix a well-founded forest $\mathfrak{F} = (F, \leq)$. We define a computable infinitary $\Sigma^0_{\lambda+2(k+1)}$ formula expressing $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$ for nodes x and y of $\mathfrak{F}$ of erank at most $\lambda + k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda = 0$ or λ is a limit ordinal. This suffices, since the disjoint union of two computable trees is a computable forest.

In the following, we write $\mathsf{erank}(x)$ for $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{F}(x))$. Let $E = E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ be the direct successor relation of $\mathfrak{F}$. For a node $x \in F$ let $\mathcal{I}(x)$ the set of finite subsets $I \subseteq F$ satisfying $x \in I$, $y \geq x$ for all $y \in I$, and if $x \leq z \leq y \in I$ then also $z \in I$. Note that by Lemma 4, the set of all $y \geq x$ with $\mathsf{erank}(y) = \mathsf{erank}(x)$ belongs to $\mathcal{I}(x)$. For a subset $A \subseteq F$ let $C(A) = \{y \in F \setminus A \mid \exists x \in A : (x, y) \in E\}$. Thus, $C(A)$ are those children of A that do not belong to A itself.

For every ordinal α we define a computable infinitary formula $\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x, y)$ over $\mathfrak{F}$ as follows: Let

$$\mathsf{iso}_0(x,y) \iff \mathfrak{F}(x) \text{ and } \mathfrak{F}(y) \text{ are finite and isomorphic;}$$

this can be expressed by a Σ^0_2 formula. For a successor ordinal $\alpha + 1$ let[6]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{iso}_{\alpha+1}(x,y) \iff\ & \exists I \in \mathcal{I}(x)\ \exists J \in \mathcal{I}(y)\ \exists \text{ isomorphism } f : \mathfrak{F}\restriction_I \to \mathfrak{F}\restriction_J : \\
& \forall z \in I\ \forall u \in C(I) \cup C(J)\ \forall \ell \geq 1 : \\
& \qquad (\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v)) \wedge \\
& \forall u \in C(I) \cup C(J) : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,u).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for a limit ordinal α, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{iso}_{\alpha}(x,y) \iff\ & \exists I \in \mathcal{I}(x)\ \exists J \in \mathcal{I}(y)\ \exists \text{ isomorphism } f : \mathfrak{F}\restriction_I \to \mathfrak{F}\restriction_J : \\
& \bigwedge_{\beta<\alpha} \forall z \in I\ \forall u \in C(I) \cup C(J)\ \forall \ell \geq 1 : \\
& \qquad (\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v)) \wedge \\
& \forall u \in C(I) \cup C(J) : \bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,u).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathsf{iso}_{\lambda+k}$ is a $\Sigma^0_{\lambda+2(k+1)}$ formula for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda = 0$ or λ a limit ordinal.[7] Hence, it suffices to show that if $\mathsf{erank}(x) \leq \alpha$ and $\mathsf{erank}(y) \leq \alpha$, then $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. This is the content of Claim 2 below. First, we have to show the following claim.

Claim 1. If $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ then $\mathsf{erank}(x) \leq \alpha$ and $\mathsf{erank}(y) \leq \alpha$.

We prove Claim 1 by induction on α. The case $\alpha = 0$ is clear because all finite trees have erank 0. Next, consider an ordinal $\alpha > 0$ such that the claim holds for all $\beta < \alpha$. Assume that $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$. Let $I \in \mathcal{I}(x)$, $J \in \mathcal{I}(y)$, and the isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{F}\restriction_I \to \mathfrak{F}\restriction_J$ witness $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$. Note that the last part of $\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ and the induction hypothesis implies that all elements of $C(I)$ have erank less than α. Thus, all leaves of I have erank at most α. Since I is finite we can conclude (by induction on the depth of I) that every element $i \in I$ has only successors of erank at most α and there are finitely many successors of erank exactly α. Thus, $\mathsf{erank}(i) \leq \alpha$ for all $i \in I$ which especially implies $\mathsf{erank}(x) \leq \alpha$. For y we conclude analogously using J and $C(J)$.

---

[6] We use $\exists^{\geq \ell} x : \varphi(x)$ as an abbreviation for $\exists x_1 \cdots \exists x_\ell : \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} x_i \neq x_j \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} \varphi(x_i)$. The quantifier $\exists^{\geq \ell} x$ can be encoded by an ordinary single existential quantifier.

[7] For $\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v)$ a Σ^0_κ formula, the formula $(\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in A : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in B : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v))$ is equivalent to the formula $(\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in A : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v) \wedge \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in B : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v)) \vee (\neg\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in A : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v) \wedge \neg\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in B : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v))$. This formula is a disjunction of a Σ^0_κ formula and a Π^0_κ formula and is therefore equivalent to a $\Pi^0_{\kappa+1}$ formula.

Claim 2. If $\mathsf{erank}(x) \le \alpha$ and $\mathsf{erank}(y) \le \alpha$, then $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$.

We prove Claim 2 by induction on α. Again, the case $\alpha = 0$ is clear. Next, consider a successor ordinal $\alpha+1$ and assume that $\mathsf{erank}(x) \le \alpha+1$ and $\mathsf{erank}(y) \le \alpha+1$. Let us first assume that $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$, and let $g : \mathfrak{F}(x) \to \mathfrak{F}(y)$ be an isomorphism. Choose $I \in \mathcal{I}(x)$ such that I contains all nodes z with $z \ge x$ and $\mathsf{erank}(z) = \mathsf{erank}(x)$. This set is finite by Lemma 4. The set J is chosen analogously for the node y. Then $f = g\restriction_I$ is an isomorphism from $\mathfrak{F}\restriction_I$ to $\mathfrak{F}\restriction_J$. We show that $\mathsf{iso}_{\alpha+1}(x,y)$ holds for I, J, and f.

Take arbitrary $z \in I$, $u \in C(I) \cup C(J)$, and $\ell \ge 1$. Hence, $\mathsf{erank}(u) < \alpha+1$, i.e., $\mathsf{erank}(u) \le \alpha$. We have to show that

$$\exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v) \iff \exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v). \tag{4}$$

But for all $v \in E(z) \setminus I$ (resp. $v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J$), we have $\mathsf{erank}(v) \le \alpha$. Hence, by induction, (4) is equivalent to

$$\exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v) \iff \exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v).$$

This is clearly true, since our isomorphism g maps z to $f(z)$ and the set I to the set J. Next, take an arbitrary $u \in C(I) \cup C(J)$. Since $\mathsf{erank}(u) \le \alpha$, the induction hypothesis implies $\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,u)$. This shows that $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_{\alpha+1}(x,y)$ holds.

For the other direction, assume that $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_{\alpha+1}(x,y)$. We have to show that $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. Let $I \in \mathcal{I}(x)$, $J \in \mathcal{I}(y)$, and the isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{F}\restriction_I \to \mathfrak{F}\restriction_J$ witness $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_{\alpha+1}(x,y)$. We know that

$$\forall u \in C(I) \cup C(J) : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,u)$$

holds. Hence Claim 1 implies that $\mathsf{erank}(u) \le \alpha$ for all $u \in C(I) \cup C(J)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall z \in I\ \forall u \in C(I) \cup C(J)\ \forall \ell \ge 1 : \\ &\qquad (\exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v) \iff \exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(u,v)) \end{aligned}$$

holds. Since $\mathsf{erank}(u) \le \alpha$ for all $u \in C(I) \cup C(J)$, the induction hypothesis implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall z \in I\ \forall u \in C(I) \cup C(J)\ \forall \ell \ge 1 : \\ &\qquad (\exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v) \iff \exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $f : \mathfrak{F}\restriction_I \to \mathfrak{F}\restriction_J$ is an isomorphism, this implies easily that $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. This concludes the proof of Claim 2 for a successor ordinal $\alpha+1$.

Finally, take a limit ordinal α and assume that Claim 2 holds for all $\beta < \alpha$.

First, assume that $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. Define g, I, J, and f as in the case of a successor ordinal. Take arbitrary $\beta < \alpha$, $z \in I$, $u \in C(I) \cup C(J)$, and $\ell \ge 1$. Hence, $\mathsf{erank}(u) < \alpha$. Let $\mathsf{erank}(u) = \gamma < \alpha$. We have to show that

$$\exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v) \iff \exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v). \tag{5}$$

If $\beta < \gamma$, then Claim 1 implies that there is no v such that $\mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v)$ holds; whence the formula is trivially satisfied. For $\beta \ge \gamma$, the induction hypothesis and Claim 1 imply that (5) is equivalent to

$$\exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v) \iff \exists^{\ge \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v).$$

We can conclude as in the case of a successor ordinal. Moreover, since $\mathsf{erank}(u) = \gamma < \alpha$ the induction hypothesis implies that $\mathsf{iso}_\gamma(u,u)$ holds. Hence $\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,u)$ also holds. This shows that $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$.

For the other direction, assume that $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$. We have to show that $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. Let $I \in \mathcal{I}(x)$, $J \in \mathcal{I}(y)$, and the isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{F}\restriction_I \to \mathfrak{F}\restriction_J$ witness $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$. We know that

$$\forall u \in C(I) \cup C(J) : \bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,u)$$

holds. Claim 1 implies that $\mathsf{erank}(u) < \alpha$ for all $u \in C(I) \cup C(J)$. Moreover, for all $\beta < \alpha$, $z \in I$, and all $u \in C(I) \cup C(J)$,

$$(\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v))$$

holds. Especially, for $\beta = \mathsf{erank}(u)$ Claim 1 and the induction hypothesis imply

$$(\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(z) \setminus I : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(f(z)) \setminus J : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v)).$$

We can conclude as in the case of a successor ordinal. This concludes the proof of Claim 2 and hence the proof of the theorem. □

Corollary 48. *The isomorphism problem for well-founded tree-automatic trees belongs to* $\Delta^0_{\omega^\omega}$.

Proof. By Corollary 44, the $\Sigma^0_{\omega^\omega}$ formula $\bigvee_{\alpha<\omega^\omega} \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ expresses $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$ for all x, y with $\mathsf{erank}(x), \mathsf{erank}(y) < \omega^\omega$.

Moreover, $\mathfrak{F} \models \neg\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,x)$ if and only if $\mathsf{erank}(x) > \alpha$. Thus, for $\beta = \max\{\mathsf{erank}(x), \mathsf{erank}(y)\}$, $\neg\mathsf{iso}_\beta(x,x) \vee \neg\mathsf{iso}_\beta(y,y) \vee \mathsf{iso}_\beta(x,y)$ is satisfied in $\mathfrak{F}$ if and only if $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. One easily concludes that the $\Pi^0_{\omega^\omega}$ formula $\bigwedge_{\alpha<\omega^\omega} (\neg\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,x) \vee \neg\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(y,y) \vee \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y))$ expresses $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$ for all x, y with $\mathsf{erank}(x), \mathsf{erank}(y) < \omega^\omega$.

Due to Corollary 44, the erank of every tree-automatic well-founded tree is strictly below ω^ω. Thus, the isomorphism problem for tree-automatic well-founded trees belongs to $\Sigma^0_{\omega^\omega} \cap \Pi^0_{\omega^\omega} = \Delta^0_{\omega^\omega}$. □

In Appendix A we provide alternative formulas for expressing $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$ in a well-founded forest. These alternative formulas are constructed inductively using the ordinary rank instead of the erank, which simplifies the proofs. Moreover, the formulas from Appendix A yield slightly better bounds for well-founded trees $\mathfrak{T}$ with $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{T}) = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{T})$ ($\Pi^0_{\lambda+2k+1}$ instead of $\Sigma^0_{\lambda+2(k+1)}$. But if the erank is smaller than the rank, the formulas from this section yield better bounds.

5 Lower bound for the isomorphism problem for well-founded trees

In this section, we prove hyperarithmetical lower bounds for the isomorphism problem for well-founded tree-automatic trees. More precisely, we show that for every ordinal ω^i, there exists a well-founded tree $\mathfrak{U}$ such that the set of all tree-automatic copies of $\mathfrak{U}$ is hard for the class $\Pi^0_{\omega^i}$. Moreover, for the class of all well-founded tree-automatic trees, we prove that the isomorphism problem is $\Delta^0_{\omega^\omega}$-hard under Turing-reductions.

5.1 Isomorphism for computable trees of rank $< \omega^\omega$

Basically, our hardness proof is a reduction from computable well-founded trees to tree-automatic well-founded trees. For this, we make use of a construction from [10], which works for all computable ordinals. We use this construction only for ordinals strictly below ω^ω. In this section, a computable tree is a computable prefix-closed subset $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*_{>0}$.[8] We identify $\mathfrak{S}$ with the tree $(\mathfrak{S}, \preceq)$, where as usual $\preceq$ denotes the prefix relation.

First, we have to fix a so called fundamental sequence for every limit ordinal $< \omega^\omega$. Each ordinal $\alpha < \omega^\omega$ can be written in its Cantor normal form as

$$\alpha = \omega^{e_i} \cdot n_i + \omega^{e_{i-1}} \cdot n_{i-1} + \cdots + \omega^{e_1} \cdot n_1,$$

where $e_i > e_{i-1} > \cdots > e_1 \geq 0$ are natural numbers and $n_j > 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq i$. Assume that $e_1 > 0$ so that α is a limit ordinal. Then

$$\alpha = \sup\{\alpha_k \mid k \geq 1\},$$

---

[8] For technical reasons, it is useful to exclude 0. This makes the construction of tree-automatic copies easier.

where we define α_k as

$$\alpha_k = \omega^{e_i} \cdot n_i + \omega^{e_{i-1}} \cdot n_{i-1} + \cdots + \omega^{e_2} \cdot n_2 + \omega^{e_1} \cdot (n_1 - 1) + \omega^{e_1 - 1} \cdot k + 1, \tag{6}$$

for $k \geq 1$. Note that α_k is a successor ordinal.

Next, we define for every ordinal $\alpha < \omega^\omega$ a computable well-founded tree $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*_{>0}$ by induction on α. Let $\mathfrak{S}_0 = \{\varepsilon\}$ be the tree consisting of a single node. If $\alpha = \beta + 1 < \omega^\omega$ is a successor ordinal then

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\beta+1} = \{nu \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, u \in \mathfrak{S}_\beta\} \cup \{\varepsilon\}.$$

Hence, $\mathfrak{S}_{\beta+1}$ consists of $\aleph_0$ many copies of $\mathfrak{S}_\beta$ together with a new root. Finally let $\alpha < \omega^\omega$ be a limit ordinal with the fundamental sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 1}$ defined in (6). Then

$$\mathfrak{S}_\alpha = \{ku \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, u \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_k}\} \cup \{\varepsilon\}.$$

Thus, $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ consists of all the trees $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_k}$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$) together with a new root. By induction on $\alpha < \omega^\omega$, it is straightforward to show that $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ is well-founded and computable. Moreover, also the set of leaves $\mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^*_{>0}$ is computable. Let $A \subseteq \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha)$. Then, with $(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha, A)$ we denote the structure consisting of the tree $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ together with the additional unary predicate A.

The following result is implicitly shown in [10, Proposition 3.2], where it is stated for all computable ordinals. But since we only defined fixed fundamental sequences for limit ordinals below ω^ω, we restrict to ordinals below ω^ω.

Theorem 49. *Given a limit ordinal $\alpha < \omega^\omega$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$ (resp., a successor ordinal $\alpha < \omega^\omega$), one can compute indices of computable subset $L^\alpha_k \subseteq \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha)$ (resp., $A_\alpha, E_\alpha \subseteq \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha)$) such that the following holds:*

From a natural number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a Π^0_α index (Π, a, e) for a set $P \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ one can compute an index for a computable subset $T_{P,n} \subseteq \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha)$ such that the following holds:

- *If α is a successor ordinal, then*

$$(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha, T_{P,n}) \cong \begin{cases} (\mathfrak{S}_\alpha, A_\alpha) & \text{if } n \in P \\ (\mathfrak{S}_\alpha, E_\alpha) & \text{if } n \notin P. \end{cases}$$

- *If α is a limit ordinal, then*

$$(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha, T_{P,n}) \cong \begin{cases} (\mathfrak{S}_\alpha, L^\alpha_\infty) & \text{if } n \in P \\ (\mathfrak{S}_\alpha, L^\alpha_k) \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0} & \text{if } n \notin P \end{cases}$$

In Proposition 3.2 from [10], the computable subset $A_\alpha \subseteq \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha)$ is replaced by a computable tree $\mathcal{A}_\alpha \subseteq \mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ (and similarly for $E_\alpha, L^\alpha_k, T_{P,n}$). For our purpose it is more convenient to work with computable subsets of the leaves of the fixed tree $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha$. Nevertheless, the construction works analogously to the proof of Proposition 3.2 from [10], except for the induction base $\alpha = 1$. In [10], the tree $\mathcal{A}_1$ consists of a single node and the tree $\mathcal{E}_1$ consists of a root with infinitely many children (i.e., $\mathcal{E}_1 \cong \mathfrak{S}_1$). For the construction of $T_{P,n}$, one takes a computable enumerable subset $P = \{n \mid \exists x : Q(x, n)\}$ (i.e., the complement of a Π^0_1-set), where Q is computable. Then the tree $\mathcal{T}_{P,n}$ consists of the root and $x \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ is a child of the root if and only if there exists $y \leq x$ satisfying $Q(y, n)$. Hence, $\mathcal{T}_{P,n} \cong \mathcal{E}_1$ if there exists x with $Q(x, n)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{P,n} \cong \mathcal{A}_1$ if $\neg Q(x, n)$ for all x.

In our context, we define the subsets $A_1, E_1, T_{P,n} \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0} = \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_1)$ as follows: let $A_1 = \emptyset$, E_1 be the set of all even numbers, and $T_{P,n} = \{2x \mid \exists y \leq x : Q(y, n)\}$. Then, we have $(\mathfrak{S}_1, T_{P,n}) \cong (\mathfrak{S}_1, E_1)$ if there exists x with $Q(x, n)$ and $(\mathfrak{S}_1, T_{P,n}) \cong (\mathfrak{S}_1, A_1)$ if $\neg Q(x, n)$ for all x.

5.2 Tree-automaticity of the trees $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$

In this section, we show that all trees $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$ ($i \geq 1$) from the previous section are tree-automatic. For this, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 50. *Let $i \geq 1$, $n \geq 1$, $\alpha \leq \omega^i$. Then we have*

$$\mathfrak{S}_\alpha \cup \{uv \mid u \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha), v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n}\} = \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n + \alpha}. \tag{7}$$

Note that the tree on the left-hand side of (7) is the tree that results from the tree $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ by replacing every leaf by a copy of the tree $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n}$.

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on $\alpha \leq \omega^i$. The case $\alpha = 0$ is clear. Next, assume that $\alpha = \gamma + 1$ is a successor ordinal. Then

$$\mathfrak{S}_\alpha = \{nu \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, u \in \mathfrak{S}_\gamma\} \cup \{\varepsilon\}. \tag{8}$$

By induction, we have

$$\mathfrak{S}_\gamma \cup \{uv \mid u \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\gamma), v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n}\} = \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n + \gamma}. \tag{9}$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_\alpha \cup \{uv \mid u \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha), v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n}\} &\overset{(8)}{=} \{nu \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, u \in \mathfrak{S}_\gamma\} \cup \\ &\quad\ \{nu'v \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, u' \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\gamma), v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n}\} \cup \{\varepsilon\} \\ &\overset{(9)}{=} \{nw \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n + \gamma}\} \cup \{\varepsilon\} \\ &= \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n + \gamma + 1} = \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n + \alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, assume that $\alpha \leq \omega^i$ is a limit ordinal with the fundamental sequence $(\alpha_k)_{k \geq 1}$. Then $(\omega^i \cdot n + \alpha_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is our fundamental sequence for the ordinal $\omega^i \cdot n + \alpha$. We have

$$\mathfrak{S}_\alpha = \{ku \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, u \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_k}\} \cup \{\varepsilon\}. \tag{10}$$

By induction, for every $k \geq 1$ we have

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_k} \cup \{uv \mid u \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_k}), v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n}\} = \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n + \alpha_k}. \tag{11}$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{S}_\alpha \cup \{uv \mid u \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_\alpha), v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n}\} &\overset{(10)}{=} \{ku \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, u \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_k}\} \cup \\ &\quad\ \{ku'v \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, u' \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_k}), v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n}\} \cup \{\varepsilon\} \\ &\overset{(11)}{=} \{kw \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}, w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n + \alpha_k}\} \cup \{\varepsilon\} \\ &= \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i \cdot n + \alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we can prove tree-automaticity of $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$.

Lemma 51. *For each $i \geq 1$, the tree $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i} \subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}^*$ is tree-automatic. Moreover, there is a unary tree-automatic copy $(L, \leq)$ of $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$ together with an isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i} \to (L, \leq)$ such that f and f^{-1} are both computable.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on i. Assume that we have already constructed a tree-automatic copy $(L, \leq)$ of the tree $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$ over a unary alphabet (i.e., $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ is regular) together with the computable isomorphism f. In addition, we assume that the root of $(L, \leq)$ is the tree $\{\varepsilon\}$; this property is preserved by the construction. We aim at constructing a unary tree-automatic copy of $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^{i+1}}$ with root $\{\varepsilon\}$. Let us first construct a tree-automatic copy of the computable forest $\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n}$. This forest is is isomorphic to the prefix relation on the domain $\{nu \mid n\geq 1, u\in \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n}\}\subseteq \mathbb{N}_{>0}^*$.

Define well-founded trees $\mathfrak{T}_n$ for $n\geq 1$ inductively as follows. Let $\mathfrak{T}_1=\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$ and let $\mathfrak{T}_{n+1}$ result from the tree $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$ by replacing every leaf by a copy of the tree $\mathfrak{T}_n$. Formally, we define

$$\mathfrak{T}_n=\{u_1\cdots u_j v \mid 0\leq j<n, u_1,\dots,u_j\in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}), v\in\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}\}.$$

Lemma 50 implies $\mathfrak{T}_n=\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n}$ for $n\geq 1$. We will construct a tree-automatic copy of $\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{T}_n$ using $(L,\leq)$. The universe of the this copy is the set L' of all trees of the form $\mathsf{pref}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n 0^i 1 t_i)$, where $n\geq 1$, $t_1,\dots,t_n\in L$ and there exists $1\leq j\leq n$ such that t_j is a leaf of $(L,\leq)$ for all $j<i$ and $t_j=\{\varepsilon\}$ for all $j>i$. Since the set of leaves of $(L,\leq)$ is regular, the set L' is clearly regular too. We define a tree-automatic partial order $\leq'$ on the set L' by comparing the t_i componentwise. Let $t=\mathsf{pref}(\bigcup_{i=1}^m 0^i 1 t_i)\in L'$ and $t'=\mathsf{pref}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n 0^i 1 t_i')\in L'$. Then $t\leq' t'$ if and only if $n=m$ and $t_i\leq t_i'$ for all $1\leq i\leq n$. From this construction, it follows easily that

$$(L',\leq')\cong \biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{T}_n=\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n}.$$

The set of roots of this forest is $\{\mathsf{pref}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n 0^i 1)\mid n\geq 1\}$. Let us also define a computable isomorphism $f':\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{T}_n\to(L',\leq')$ with a computable inverse. Take an element nw from $\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{T}_n$, where $n\in\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $w\in\mathfrak{T}_n$. There exists a unique factorization $w=u_1\cdots u_j v$ with $0\leq j<n$, $u_1,\dots,u_j\in\mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i})$, and $v\in\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$. Since the set $\mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i})$ is computable, we can compute this factorization. Next, using the computable isomorphism $f:\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}\to(L,\leq)$ define the trees $t_k=f(u_k)$ $(1\leq k\leq j)$, $t_{j+1}=f(v)$, and $t_{j+2},\dots,t_n=\{\varepsilon\}$. Then set $f'(nw)=\mathsf{pref}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n 0^i 1 t_i)$. It is straightforward to verify that this defines indeed an isomorphism from $\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{T}_n$ to $(L',\leq')$. Moreover, the inverse of f' is computable too (using the fact that f^{-1} is computable).

Next, we derive from $(L',\leq')$ a tree-automatic copy of the computable forest $\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n+1}$. This forest is isomorphic to the prefix relation on

$$\{nu\mid n\in\mathbb{N}_{>0}, u\in\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n+1}\}=\mathbb{N}_{>0}\cup\{nmw\mid n,m\in\mathbb{N}_{>0}, w\in\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n}\}.$$

Note that in every node $u\in\mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$ of the forest $(L',\leq')$, the root of u has no right child (i.e., $1\notin u$). Define the regular set of trees

$$L''=\{\mathsf{pref}(0^n)\mid n\geq 1\}\cup\{\mathsf{pref}(\{1^m\}\cup t)\mid t\in L', m\geq 1\}.$$

On the set L'' we define the partial order $\leq''$ as follows. For $u,v\in L''$, let $u\leq'' v$ if and only if either

- $u=\mathsf{pref}(\{1^m\}\cup s)$, $v=\mathsf{pref}(\{1^m\}\cup t)$ with $s\leq' t$ or
- $u=\mathsf{pref}(0^n)$, $v=\mathsf{pref}(\{1^m\}\cup t)\in L''$ with t of the form $\mathsf{pref}(\bigcup_{i=1}^n 0^i 1 t_i)$.

This order relation is clearly tree-automatic. Moreover, the construction implies that

$$(L'',\leq'')\cong(\mathbb{N}_{>0}\cup\{nmw\mid n,m\in\mathbb{N}_{>0}, w\in\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n}\},\preceq)=\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n+1}.$$

A computable isomorphism $f'':\biguplus_{n\geq 1}\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n+1}\to(L'',\leq'')$ can be defined as follows. For a root $n\in\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ let $f''(n)=\mathsf{pref}(0^n)$. A node nmu with $n,m\in\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ and $u\in\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n}$ (hence, $mu\in\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i\cdot n+1}$) is mapped to $f''(nmu)=\mathsf{pref}(\{1^m\}\cup t)$ with $f'(nu)=t$. Clearly, the inverse of f'' is computable too.

Finally, we add to the forest $(L'',\leq'')$ the root $\{\varepsilon\}$; this gives us a tree-automatic copy of the tree $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^{i+1}}$ with root $\{\varepsilon\}$. A computable isomorphism with computable inverse is obtained by extending f'' by $f''(\varepsilon)=\{\varepsilon\}$. $\square$

5.3 Encoding Σ^0_2-sets of binary trees

Theorem 49 and Lemma 51 show that the isomorphism problem for the following class of computable structures is $\Pi^0_{\omega^i}$-hard for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$: the class contains all structures of the form $(V, \sqsubseteq, X)$ where $(V, \sqsubseteq)$ is the unary tree-automatic copy of $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$ from Lemma 51 and X is a computable unary predicate, which is moreover a subset of $\mathsf{leaves}(V, \sqsubseteq)$. By Lemma 6 we can moreover assume that $V \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$, i.e., V consists of unlabeled full binary trees.

Let us define the set

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}} = \{\{\varepsilon\} \cup 0u \mid u \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}\}.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ contains all trees $t \in \mathcal{T}_2^{\mathsf{fin}}$, where the root of t has no right child ($1 \notin t$), the root has a left child ($0 \in t$), and the subtree rooted at 0 belongs to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$, i.e., is a full binary tree.

In this section, we will describe an encoding of Σ^0_2-subsets of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ by sets of tree-automatic trees of height 3. Actually, we will need this encoding only for computable subsets of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ (instead of Σ^0_2-sets), but the proof of Lemma 52 is not simpler for a computable set B.

Lemma 52. *There exist two trees U_0 and U_1 of height 3 ($U_0 \ncong U_1$) with the following property: From a given index of a Σ^0_2-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ one can effectively construct a tree-automatic forest $\mathfrak{F}_B$ of height 3 such that:*

- *The set of roots of $\mathfrak{F}_B$ is $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$.*
- *For every $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$, $\mathfrak{F}_B(t) \cong U_0$ if $t \in B$ and $\mathfrak{F}_B(t) \cong U_1$ if $t \notin B$.*

Restricting to trees from $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ makes our encoding technically a bit simpler, and this restriction can be easily enforced later when we apply Lemma 52.

We prove Lemma 52 using a similar statement for words from [17]. First, we have to introduce a notation from [17]. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \Delta, I, F)$ be a finite nondeterministic *string* automaton, where Q is the set of states, Σ is the input alphabet, $\Delta \subseteq Q \times \Sigma \times Q$ is the set of transition triples, I is the set of initial states, and F is the set of final states. An *successful run* of $\mathcal{A}$ on a non-empty word $w \in \Sigma^+$ is a word $(q_0, a_1, q_1)(q_1, a_2, q_2) \cdots (q_{n-1}, a_n, q_n)$ over Δ such that $q_0 \in I$, $q_n \in F$, and $w = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n$. The language $L(\mathcal{A})$ accepted by $\mathcal{A}$ consists of all non-empty words (for technical reasons, the empty word was excluded in [17]) that have a successful run. We define a forest forest($\mathcal{A}$) in the following. Clearly, $(L(\mathcal{A}), \preceq)$ (recall that $\preceq$ denotes the prefix relation on words) is a forest. The set of all leaves of the forest $(L(\mathcal{A}), \preceq)$ is again a regular language; let us denote this language with $\mathsf{leaves}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq L(\mathcal{A})$. Then, we define the forest

$$\mathrm{forest}(\mathcal{A}) = (L(\mathcal{A}) \uplus \{r \in \Delta^+ \mid r \text{ is a successful run of } \mathcal{A} \text{ on some } v \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathcal{A})\}, \leq),$$

where $u \leq v$ if (i) either $u, v \in L(\mathcal{A})$ and $u \preceq v$ or (ii) $u \in L(\mathcal{A})$ and $v \in \Delta^+$ is a successful run of $\mathcal{A}$ on some $w \in \mathsf{leaves}(\mathcal{A})$ with $u \preceq w$. Clearly, forest($\mathcal{A}$) is string-automatic. Intuitively, we take the forest resulting from the prefix order on the regular language $L(\mathcal{A})$ and append to each leaf v of $(L(\mathcal{A}), \preceq)$ all successful runs of $\mathcal{A}$ on v as children. All these children are leaves in forest($\mathcal{A}$). In [17], the following lemma was proved.

Lemma 53. *There exist two trees U_0 and U_1 of height 3 ($U_0 \ncong U_1$) with the following property: From a given index of a Σ^0_2-set $A \subseteq \{0,1\}^*1$ one can effectively construct a finite string automaton $\mathcal{A}$ (over an alphabet Σ with $0, 1, \sharp \in \Sigma$) such that $\mathfrak{F}_A = \mathrm{forest}(\mathcal{A})$ is a forest of height 3 with the following properties.*

- *The set of roots of $\mathfrak{F}_A$ is $\{0,1\}^*1\sharp$.*
- *For every $w \in \{0,1\}^*1$, $\mathfrak{F}_A(w\sharp) \cong U_0$ if $w \in A$, and $\mathfrak{F}_A(w\sharp) \cong U_1$ if $w \notin A$.*

In order to prove Lemma 52 using Lemma 53, we have to encode trees from $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ by words. A tree $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$ can be encoded by a non-empty bracket expression, i.e., a word over the alphabet $\{(,)\}$. Here, we view such a bracket expression as a binary string by identifying (with 0 and) with 1. Thus, we define a nonempty word $\mathsf{word}(t) \in \{0,1\}^+$ as follows: Consider a depth-first left-to-right traversal of t. Each time, we move from a node v to one of its children, we write down the digit 0.

Each time, we move from a node vi to its parent node v, we write down the digit 1. The resulting word is $\mathsf{word}(t)$. Formally, let $\mathsf{word}(\{\varepsilon\}) = \varepsilon$ and for $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}} \setminus \{\{\varepsilon\}\}$ such that $t = \{\varepsilon\} \cup 0t_1 \cup 1t_2$ let

$$\mathsf{word}(t) = 0\mathsf{word}(t_1)10\mathsf{word}(t_2)1.$$

This mapping word is clearly injective. Finally, for $t = (\{\varepsilon\} \cup 0u) \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ with $u \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$ let $\mathsf{word}(t) = 0\mathsf{word}(u)1$. Also the mapping $\mathsf{word} : \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}} \to 0\{0,1\}^*1$ is injective.

Let us now fix an alphabet Σ such that $0, 1, \sharp \in \Sigma$ (as in Lemma 53). Take a word $w = u\sharp v$ with $u \in \{0,1\}^*$, $v \in \Sigma^*$ and $u = \mathsf{word}(t)$ for some tree $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$. Note that the root of t has no right child in t. For $1 \leq i \leq |v|$ let a_i be the i^{th} symbol of v. We encode w by the Σ-labeled tree $\mathsf{tree}(w) = (T, \lambda) \in \mathcal{T}^{\mathsf{fin}}_{2,\Sigma}$, where

$$T = t \cup \{1^i \mid 1 \leq i \leq |v|\} \tag{12}$$

$$\lambda(x) = \begin{cases} a_i & \text{if } x = 1^i \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq |v| \\ \sharp & \text{else} \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

Note that $\mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp) = t$, since we identify an unlabeled tree with a tree where all nodes are labeled with $\sharp$.

Lemma 54. *From a given string automaton $\mathcal{A}$ such that $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \Sigma^*$ one can construct effectively a tree automaton $\mathcal{B}$ over Σ such that for every tree $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ and every word $v \in \Sigma^*$ the following holds: The number of successful runs of $\mathcal{A}$ on the string $\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v$ equals the number of successful runs of $\mathcal{B}$ on the tree $\mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, \Delta, I, F)$. Note that $\mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v)$ consists of the tree t to which we add at the root a right branch of length $|v|$. The i^{th} node on this branch (we start counting in the root) is labeled with the i^{th} symbol of $\sharp v$. Essentially, the tree automaton $\mathcal{B}$ simulates a tree-walking automaton $\mathcal{W}$ (see [6] for a survey, but we do not need a formal definition of tree walking automata) that walks over the tree $\mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\$v)$ in depth-first left-to-right order. Thereby, $\mathcal{W}$ simulates the string automaton $\mathcal{A}$. The automaton $\mathcal{W}$ starts in the root of the tree. In a first phase (which is finished if $\mathcal{W}$ returns to the root), $\mathcal{W}$ behaves as follows: each time, $\mathcal{W}$ moves down in the tree (towards the leaves), it simulates a 0-labeled transition of $\mathcal{A}$, and each time, $\mathcal{W}$ moves up in the tree (towards the root), it simulates a 1-labeled transition of $\mathcal{A}$. After the first phase, the tree t is fully traversed and $\mathcal{W}$ goes into the right branch of $\mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v)$ (which is labeled with the word $\sharp v$) and continues the simulation of $\mathcal{A}$.

Here is a formal definition of the tree automaton $\mathcal{B} = (Q', \Delta', I', F')$, which simulates a tree-walking automaton $\mathcal{W}$ with the above behavior. Fix an arbitrary final state $q_{\mathsf{f}} \in F$. The state set of $\mathcal{B}$ is

$$Q' = (Q \times Q \times Q) \cup (I \times Q) \cup Q,$$

the set of initial states is $I' = I \times Q$, and the set of final states is F. The set of transitions is $\Delta' = \Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2 \cup \Delta_3$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &= \{((p_1, p_2), \sharp, (q_1, q_2, q_3), r) \mid p_1 \in I, (p_1, 0, q_1), (q_3, 1, p_2), (p_2, \sharp, r) \in \Delta\}, \\ \Delta_2 &= \{((p_1, p_2, p_3), \sharp, (q_1, q_2, q_3), (r_1, r_2, r_3)) \mid (p_1, 0, q_1), (q_3, 1, p_2), (p_2, 0, r_1), (r_3, 1, p_3) \in \Delta\} \cup \\ &\qquad \{((p, p, p), \sharp, q_{\mathsf{f}}, q_{\mathsf{f}}) \mid p \in Q\}, \\ \Delta_3 &= \{(p, a, q_{\mathsf{f}}, q) \mid (p, a, q) \in \Delta\}. \end{aligned}$$

With the transitions in Δ_1 we split the simulation of the tree-walking automaton into its first and second phase, i.e., p_2 in Δ_1 is the state reached by the tree-walking automaton after traversing the tree t. The transitions in Δ_2 simulate the transversal of t, whereas the transitions in Δ_3 simulate the the string automaton $\mathcal{A}$ on the right $\sharp v$-labeled branch. ☐

Let us now prove Lemma 52.

Proof of Lemma 52. Fix a Σ_2^0-set $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$. Then the set $A = \mathsf{word}(B) \subseteq 0\{0,1\}^*1$ belongs to Σ_2^0 as well (the range of the word-mapping is computable and on its range, the inverse of word is computable too). Therefore, we can apply Lemma 53 to the set $\mathsf{word}(B)$. We obtain (effectively) a finite string automaton $\mathcal{A}$ (over an alphabet Σ with $0, 1, \sharp \in \Sigma$) such that $\mathfrak{F}_A = \mathrm{forest}(\mathcal{A})$ is a forest of height 3 with the following properties.

- The set of roots of $\mathfrak{F}_A$ is $\{0,1\}^*1\sharp$.
- For every $w \in \{0,1\}^*1$, $\mathfrak{F}_A(w\sharp) \cong U_0$ if $w \in A$, and $\mathfrak{F}_A(w\sharp) \cong U_1$ if $w \notin A$.

To the string automaton $\mathcal{A}$ we next apply Lemma 54. We obtain (effectively) a tree automaton $\mathcal{B}$ over Σ such that for every tree $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ and every word $v \in \Sigma^*$ the following holds: The number of successful runs of $\mathcal{A}$ on the string $\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v$ equals the number of successful runs of $\mathcal{B}$ on the tree $\mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v)$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ accepts every word from $\{0,1\}^*1\sharp$ (this set is the set of roots of $\mathfrak{F}_A$), $\mathcal{B}$ accepts every tree $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$.

By taking the product with a deterministic tree automaton that accepts the set of trees $\{\mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v) \mid t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}, v \in \Sigma^*\}$ (which is regular), we can assume that

$$L(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq \{\mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v) \mid t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}, v \in \Sigma^*\}.$$

For trees $t_1 = \mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v_1)$, $t_2 = \mathsf{tree}(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp v_2)$ let us write $t_1 \sqsubseteq t_2$ if v_1 is a prefix of v_2. Clearly, this is a tree-automatic relation. Let

$$\max(\mathcal{B}) = \{t \in L(\mathcal{B}) \mid \text{there does not exist } t' \in L(\mathcal{B}) \text{ with } t \sqsubset t'\};$$

this set is regular as well. We can now construct a tree-automatic forest $\mathfrak{F}_B$ of height 3 as follows. The set of nodes of $\mathfrak{F}_B$ is

$$L(\mathcal{B}) \cup \bigcup_{t \in \max(\mathcal{B})} \mathsf{Run}(\mathcal{B}, t).$$

Since $\max(\mathcal{B})$ is regular, this set is regular too. The order relation of the forest $\mathfrak{F}_B$ is the tree-automatic relation

$$\sqsubseteq \;\cup\; \{(t, \rho) \mid \exists u \in \max(\mathcal{B}) : t \sqsubseteq u, \rho \in \mathsf{Run}(\mathcal{B}, u)\}.$$

The set of roots of $\mathfrak{F}_B$ is (as required) $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$. Moreover, for every tree $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$, the construction directly implies that $\mathfrak{F}_B(t) \cong \mathfrak{F}_A(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp)$. Hence, for every tree $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$ we have $\mathfrak{F}_B(t) \cong U_0$ if and only if $\mathfrak{F}_A(\mathsf{word}(t)\sharp) \cong U_0$ if and only if $\mathsf{word}(t) \in A = \mathsf{word}(B)$ if and only if $t \in B$, and similarly, $\mathfrak{F}_B(t) \cong U_1$ if and only if $t \notin B$. ☐

5.4 Hardness for the isomorphism problem

Hardness of the isomorphism problem for well-founded tree-automatic trees is established through the following theorem.

Theorem 55. *From a given $i \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$, one can compute a well-founded tree-automatic tree $\mathfrak{V}_i$ such that the following holds: From a given $\Pi^0_{\omega^i}$-set $P \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ (represented by a $\Pi^0_{\omega^i}$ index) and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ one can compute a well-founded tree-automatic tree $\mathfrak{W}_{P,n}$ such that $n \in P$ if and only if $\mathfrak{V}_i \cong \mathfrak{W}_{P,n}$*

Proof. Fix $i \geq 1$, an arbitrary $\Pi^0_{\omega^i}$-set $P \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. According to Theorem 49 there exists effectively a computable subset $L_i = L_\infty^{\omega^i} \subseteq \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i})$ such that the following holds. From an index for P and n one can compute an index for a computable subset $T_{P,n} \subseteq \mathsf{leaves}(\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i})$ such that $(\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}, L_i) \cong (\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}, T_{P,n})$ if and only if $n \in P$. By Lemma 51, the tree $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$ is tree-automatic and there exists a unary tree-automatic copy $(S, \leq)$ of $\mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i}$ together with a computable isomorphism $f : \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i} \to (S, \leq)$ such that f^{-1} is computable too. Moreover, by Lemma 6 we can assume that $S \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$. Finally, by applying the computable mapping $t \mapsto \{\varepsilon\} \cup 0t$ on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{bin}}$, we can even assume that $S \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$. Since the inverse of this mapping is computable too, there still exists a computable $f : \mathfrak{S}_{\omega^i} \to (S, \leq)$ with f^{-1} computable as well. Hence, the sets $L_i' = f(L_i) \subseteq S$

and $T'_{P,n} = f(T_{P,n}) \subseteq S$ are computable and in particular Σ^0_2. We have $n \in P$ if and only if $(S, \leq, L'_i) \cong (S, \leq, T'_{P,n})$.

Next, using Lemma 52 we obtain two trees U_0 and U_1 of height 3 and from the indices of the computable sets L'_i and $T'_{P,n}$, we can compute two tree-automatic forests G_i and $H_{P,n}$ of height 3 such that the following holds.

- The set of roots of G_i (resp. $H_{P,n}$) is $\mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$.
- For every $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$, $G_i(t) \cong U_0$ if $t \in L'_i$ and $G_i(t) \cong U_1$ otherwise.
- For every $t \in\in \mathcal{T}_{\mathsf{lef}}$, $H_{P,n}(t) \cong U_0$ if $t \in T'_{P,n}$ and $H_{P,n}(t) \cong U_1$ otherwise.

Note that by Theorem 7, $\mathsf{leaves}(S, \leq)$ is a regular set of trees since it is first-order definable in the tree-automatic tree $(S, \leq)$. Let G'_i (resp. $H'_{P,n}$) be the restriction of the forest G_i (resp. $H_{P,n}$) to those trees with a root from $\mathsf{leaves}(S, \leq)$. It follows that G'_i and $H'_{P,n}$ are again tree-automatic forests of height 3. Moreover, we can assume that the intersection of the domains of G'_i (resp. $H'_{P,n}$) and S equals $\mathsf{leaves}(S, \leq)$. Finally, let $\mathfrak{V}_i$ (resp. $\mathfrak{W}_{P,n}$) be the well-founded tree-automatic tree obtained from the union of G'_i (resp. $H'_{P,n}$) and $(S, \leq)$. Hence, $\mathfrak{V}_i$ (resp. $\mathfrak{W}_{P,n}$) results from the tree $(S, \leq)$ by (i) replacing every leaf which belongs to L'_i (resp. $T'_{P,n}$) by the tree-automatic height-3 tree U_0 and by (ii) replacing every leaf which does not belong to L'_i (resp. $T'_{P,n}$) by the tree-automatic height-3 tree U_1. Since $U_0 \ncong U_1$, we have $n \in P$ if and only if $(S, \leq, L'_i) \cong (S, \leq, T'_{P,n})$ if and only if $\mathfrak{V}_i \cong \mathfrak{W}_{P,n}$. ☐

Theorem 56. *The isomorphism problem for well-founded tree-automatic trees is $\Delta^0_{\omega^\omega}$-hard under Turing-reductions.*

Proof. Let Φ_e be a total computable function that maps $i \in \mathbb{N}$ to an ordinal notation $a_i \in O$ with $|a_i|_O = \omega^i$. Hence $3 \cdot 5^e$ is an ordinal notation for ω^ω. Recall that $\Delta^0_{\omega^\omega}$ consists of all sets that are Turing-reducible to

$$H(3 \cdot 5^e) = \{\langle a, n\rangle \mid a <_O 3 \cdot 5^e, n \in H(a)\}.$$

This set is Turing-reducible to

$$A = \{\langle i, n\rangle \mid i \geq 1, n \in H(a_i)\}.$$

To see this, take a pair $\langle a, n\rangle$. First, check whether $a <_O 3 \cdot 5^e$. Since the set $\{b \in O \mid b <_O 3 \cdot 5^e\}$ is computably enumerable [2, Prop. 4.10], this is effectively possible using the halting problem as an oracle. Clearly, the halting problem is computable in $H(a_1) = H(\omega)$ and hence in A. If $a <_O 3 \cdot 5^e$, we can compute effectively $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a <_O a_i$: Simply enumerate all sets $B_i = \{b \in O \mid b <_O a_i\}$ until a is found. Having $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a <_O a_i$ we can finally compute m such that $m \in H(a_i)$ if and only if $n \in H(a)$ (more precisely, from $a, a_i \in O$ one can compute an index for a many-one reduction of $H(a)$ to $H(a_i)$ [20, p. 437]).

Finally, we reduce the set A to the isomorphism problem for well-founded tree-automatic trees. Take a pair $\langle i, n\rangle$. From i, n (and a $\Pi^0_{\omega^i}$ index for the $\Delta^0_{\omega^i}$-set $H(a_i)$, which can be computed from i) we can compute by Theorem 55 two well-founded tree-automatic trees $\mathfrak{V}$ and $\mathfrak{W}$ such that $n \in H(a_i)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{V} \cong \mathfrak{W}$. Hence, $\langle i, n\rangle \in A$ if and only if $\mathfrak{V} \cong \mathfrak{W}$. This proves the theorem. ☐

Acknowledgment

The first author thanks Martin Huschenbett for helpful discussions on the proofs in Section 3.1.

References

1. Uri Abraham and Robert Bonnet. Hausdorff's theorem for posets that satisfy the finite antichain property. *Fund. Math*, 159:51–69, 1999.

2. C. J. Ash and J. Knight. *Computable structures and the hyperarithmetical hierarchy*, volume 144 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 2000.
3. Vince Bárány, Erich Grädel, and Sasha Rubin. Automata-based presentations of infinite structures. In *Finite and Algorithmic Model Theory*, number 379 in London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series, pages 1–76. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
4. Achim Blumensath. Automatic structures. Diploma thesis, RWTH Aachen, 1999.
5. Achim Blumensath and Erich Grädel. Finite presentations of infinite structures: Automata and interpretations. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 37:642–674, 2004.
6. Mikolaj Bojanczyk. Tree-walking automata, 2008. tutorial at LATA 2008, `www.mimuw.edu.pl/~bojan/papers/twasurvey.pdf`.
7. Wesley Calvert and Julia F. Knight. Classification from a computable viewpoint. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 12(2):191–218, 2006.
8. Christian Delhommé. Automaticité des ordinaux et des graphes homogènes. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I*, 339:5–10, 2004.
9. S. S. Goncharov and J. F. Knight. Computable structure and antistructure theorems. *Algebra Logika*, 41(6):639–681, 2002.
10. Denis R. Hirschfeldt and Walker M. White. Realizing levels of the hyperarithmetic hierarchy as degree spectra of relations on computable structures. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 43(1):51–64, 2002.
11. Martin Huschenbett. Word automaticity of tree automatic scattered linear orderings is decidable. available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1201.5070`.
12. A. Kartzow. *First-Order Model Checking On Generalisations of Pushdown Graphs*. PhD thesis, TU Darmstadt Fachbereich Mathematik, July 2011.
13. Bakhadyr Khoussainov and Mia Minnes. Model theoretic complexity of automatic structures. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 161(3):416–426, 2009.
14. Bakhadyr Khoussainov and Anil Nerode. Automatic presentations of structures. In *LCC: International Workshop on Logic and Computational Complexity*, number 960 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 367–392. Springer, 1995.
15. Bakhadyr Khoussainov, André Nies, Sasha Rubin, and Frank Stephan. Automatic structures: richness and limitations. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 3(2):2:2, 18 pp. (electronic), 2007.
16. Bakhadyr Khoussainov, Sasha Rubin, and Frank Stephan. Automatic linear orders and trees. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 6(4):675–700, 2005.
17. Dietrich Kuske, Jiamou Liu, and Markus Lohrey. The isomorphism problem on classes of automatic structures with transitive relations. to appear in *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, available at `https://www.informatik.uni-leipzig.de/~lohrey/10-ISO-AUT.pdf`, 2011.
18. Dietrich Kuske and Markus Lohrey. Automatic structures of bounded degree revisited. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 76(4):1352–1380, 2011.
19. Graham P. Oliver and Richard M. Thomas. Automatic presentations for finitely generated groups. In Volker Diekert and Bruno Durand, editors, *Proceedings of STACS 2005*, number 3404 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 693–704. Springer, 2005.
20. H. Rogers. *Theory of Recursive Functions and Effective Computability*. McGraw-Hill, 1968.
21. J. Rosenstein. *Linear Ordering*. Academic Press, 1982.
22. A. W. To and L. Libkin. Recurrent reachability analysis in regular model checking. In *Proceedings of LPAR 2008*, number 5330 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 198–213, 2008.

A Alternative formulas for rank replacing erank

Theorem 57. *Let α be a computable ordinal and assume that $\alpha = \lambda + k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and λ is not a successor ordinal. The isomorphism problem for well-founded computable trees of rank at most α belongs to level $\Pi^0_{\lambda+2k+1}$ of the hyperarithmetical hierarchy.*

Proof. Let us fix a well-founded forest $\mathfrak{F} = (F, \leq)$. We will define a computable infinitary $\Pi^0_{\lambda+2k+1}$ formula expressing $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$ for nodes x and y of $\mathfrak{F}$ of rank at most $\lambda + k$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lambda = 0$ or λ is a limit ordinal. This suffices, since the disjoint union of two computable trees is a computable forest.

Let $E = E_{\mathfrak{F}}$ be the direct successor relation of $\mathfrak{F}$. For every ordinal α we define a computable infinitary formula $\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x, y)$ over $\mathfrak{F}$ as follows: Let

$$\mathsf{iso}_0(x, y) \iff \forall z : \neg x < z \wedge \neg y < z.$$

This is a Π^0_1 formula. For a successor ordinal $\alpha+1$ let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{iso}_{\alpha+1}(x,y) \iff{}& \forall u \in E(x)\cup E(y)\ \forall \ell \geq 1 :\\ &\quad (\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(x) : \mathsf{iso}_{\alpha}(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(y) : \mathsf{iso}_{\alpha}(u,v)) \wedge\\ & \forall u \in E(x)\cup E(y) : \mathsf{iso}_{\alpha}(u,u).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for a limit ordinal α, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{iso}_{\alpha}(x,y) \iff{}& \bigwedge_{\beta<\alpha} \forall u \in E(x)\cup E(y)\ \forall \ell \geq 1 :\\ &\quad (\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(x) : \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(y) : \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,v)) \wedge\\ & \forall u \in E(x)\cup E(y) : \bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,u).\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathsf{iso}_{\lambda+k}$ is a $\Pi^0_{\lambda+2k+1}$ formula. Hence, it suffices to show that if $\mathsf{rank}(x) \leq \alpha$ and $\mathsf{rank}(y) \leq \alpha$, then $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. This is the content of Claim 2 below. As an auxiliary step we show the following claim.

Claim 1. If $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ then $\mathsf{rank}(x) \leq \alpha$ and $\mathsf{rank}(y) \leq \alpha$.

We prove Claim 1 by induction on α. The case $\alpha = 0$ is clear because trees of rank 0 do only consist of one node. Next, consider an ordinal $\alpha > 0$ such that the claim holds for all $\beta < \alpha$. Assume that $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$. Note that the last part of $\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ and the induction hypothesis imply that all successors of x have rank less than α. Thus, $\mathsf{rank}(x) \leq \sup\{\beta+1 \mid \beta < \alpha\} = \alpha$. For y we conclude analogously.

Claim 2. If $\mathsf{rank}(x) \leq \alpha$ and $\mathsf{rank}(y) \leq \alpha$, then $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$.

We prove Claim 2 by induction on α. Again, the case $\alpha = 0$ is clear. Next, consider some ordinal $\alpha > 0$ and assume that $\mathsf{rank}(x) \leq \alpha$ and $\mathsf{rank}(y) \leq \alpha$.

First assume that $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. Fix $\beta < \alpha$, $u \in E(x) \cup E(y)$, and $\ell \geq 1$. By assumption, we have $\mathsf{rank}(u) < \alpha$. Furthermore, due to Claim 1, if $\beta < \mathsf{rank}(u)$, then there is no v such that $\mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v)$ holds. Thus, in this case

$$\left(\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(x) : \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(y) : \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,v)\right).$$

holds. Moreover, if $\mathsf{rank}(u) \leq \beta < \alpha$, then Claim 1 and the induction hypothesis imply that

$$\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(x) : \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(y) : \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,v)$$

is equivalent to

$$\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(x) : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(y) : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v).$$

Since $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$ the latter is clearly satisfied. Moreover, by induction hypothesis for each $u \in E(x) \cup E(y)$ we have $\mathsf{iso}_{\mathsf{rank}(u)}(u,u)$. Hence $\bigvee_{\beta<\alpha} \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,u)$ holds as well. Thus $\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ is satisfied.

For the other direction, assume that $\mathfrak{F} \models \mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$. Then for each $u \in E(x) \cup E(y)$, there is some $\beta < \alpha$ such that $\mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,u)$ holds. Due to Claim 1 this implies that $\mathsf{rank}(u) < \alpha$ for each child u of x or y. Due to the induction hypothesis and Claim 1, for all $\mathsf{rank}(u) \leq \beta < \alpha$

$$\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(x) : \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(y) : \mathsf{iso}_{\beta}(u,v) \tag{14}$$

is equivalent to

$$\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(x) : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v) \iff \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(y) : \mathfrak{F}(u) \cong \mathfrak{F}(v). \tag{15}$$

Since $\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y)$ holds, for each $u \in E(x) \cup E(y)$ there is a $\mathsf{rank}(u) \leq \beta < \alpha$ such that (14) holds. Hence, (15) holds for all children u of x or y, which implies that $\mathfrak{F}(x) \cong \mathfrak{F}(y)$. □

Remark 58. If we are only interested in the isomorphism problem for trees of rank λ for a limit ordinal λ it suffices to consider the formula

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{iso}_\alpha(x,y) \iff \bigwedge_{\beta<\alpha} &\forall u \in E(x) \cup E(y)\ \forall \ell \geq 1 : \\ &(\exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(x) : \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v) \Longleftrightarrow \exists^{\geq \ell} v \in E(y) : \mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,v)),\end{aligned}$$

which is Π^0_λ. This is because if the rank of the root is bounded by λ, any child of the root has rank strictly below λ and satisfies $\mathsf{iso}_\beta(u,u)$ for some $\beta < \lambda$. For erank this trick does not work because the initial segments I and J may be chosen in the wrong way.

B Rank and erank on partial orders

We know that the ranks and eranks of string-automatic forests are strictly below ω^2 and ω, respectively, see Corollary 45 and [17]. We know from [13] that the ranks of string-automatic partial orders grow up to every ordinal below ω^ω. The ordinal ω^n is a string-automatic partial order of rank ω^n. In the following, we consider well-founded forests as well-founded partial orders.[9] Every well-founded forest is a well-founded partial order without infinite chains because the path from any node to its corresponding root is of finite length. In the following, we investigate the ranks and eranks of well-founded partial orders without infinite chains. For the string-automatic case we construct such orders with erank and rank above any ordinal strictly below ω^ω. This means that for well-founded string-automatic partial orders the ranks of orders without infinite chains can grow as much as for arbitrary well-founded string-automatic partial orders.

The analogous question for tree-automatic well-founded partial orders remains open: Is there for every $\alpha < \omega^{\omega^\omega}$ a well-founded tree-automatic partial order without infinite chains that has erank or rank above α?

Let us first adapt the notions of rank and erank to well-founded partial orders.

Definition 59. *Let $\mathfrak{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a well-founded partial order. A* ranking *of $\mathfrak{P}$ is an ordinal valued strictly monotone map f with domain P. This means that $p_1 < p_2$ implies $f(p_1) < f(p_2)$. The f*-rank *of $\mathfrak{P}$ is $\sup\{f(p) \mid p \in P\}$. The* rank of $\mathfrak{P}$ *is the minimum of the f-ranks for all ranking functions f. The rank of $\mathfrak{P}$ is also called its* ordinal height. *It can be defined equivalently by considering the ranking function* rank *inductively defined by (let $\sup(\emptyset) = 0$)*

$$\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) = \sup\{\mathsf{rank}(p', \mathfrak{P}) + 1 \mid p' < p \in P\}.$$

The rank of $\mathfrak{P}$ is then

$$\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}) = \sup\{\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) \mid p \in P\}.$$

We define the ordinal valued erank of a node $p \in P$ inductively by

$$\mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) = \sup\{\alpha + 1 \mid \exists^\infty p' : p' < p \text{ and } \mathsf{erank}(p', \mathfrak{P}) \geq \alpha\}.$$

The erank *of $\mathfrak{P}$ is then*

$$\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}) = \sup\{\alpha + 1 \mid \exists^\infty p \in P : \mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) \geq \alpha\}.$$

Remark 60. It is easily shown that this definition of rank and erank coincides with the one given for forests if $\mathfrak{P}$ is a forest. Moreover, note that if $\mathfrak{P}$ has a global maximum p_m, i.e., if $p \leq p_m$ for all $p \in P$, then $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}) = \mathsf{rank}(p_m, \mathfrak{P})$ and $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}) = \mathsf{erank}(p_m, \mathfrak{P})$.

The following lemma generalizes Lemma 5 from well-founded trees to arbitrary well-founded partial orders; the proof is essentially the same:

---

[9] Well-foundedness of partial orders is usually understood as the absence of infinite descending chains. Thus, we consider the root of a tree to be its maximal element throughout this section.

Lemma 61. *For $\mathfrak{P}$ a well-founded partial order, we have* $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}) < \omega \cdot (\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}) + 1)$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{P} = (P, \leq)$. We first prove by induction that $\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) < \omega \cdot (\mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) + 1)$ for each $p \in \mathfrak{P}$. If $\mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) = 0$ then $\{p' \mid p' < p\}$ is finite. If the size of this set if $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $k + 1 < \omega \cdot (0 + 1)$ is an upper bound on $\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P})$.

Assume now that for all $p \in P$, $\mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) < \alpha$ implies $\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) < \omega \cdot (\mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) + 1)$. Let $p \in P$ with $\mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) = \alpha$. We have to show that $\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) < \omega \cdot (\alpha + 1)$.

Set $M_p = \{p' < p \mid \mathsf{erank}(p', \mathfrak{P}) = \mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P})\}$ and $N_p = \{p' < p \mid p' \notin M_p\}$. By definition of erank, M_p is a finite convex set and the rank of all elements in N_p is strictly below $\omega \cdot \alpha$. Let $|M_p| = k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, we get

$$\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) \leq \omega \cdot \alpha + k + 1 < \omega \cdot \alpha + \omega = \omega \cdot (\alpha + 1).$$

Now let $\alpha = \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P})$. This implies that $|\{p \in P \mid \mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) = \alpha\}| \leq k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, all but k elements of $\mathfrak{P}$ have rank strictly below $\omega \cdot (\beta + 1) \leq \omega \cdot \alpha$ for some $\beta < \alpha$. It follows that all elements of $\mathfrak{P}$ have rank at most $\omega \cdot \alpha + k$. Hence, $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}) < \omega \cdot \alpha + \omega = \omega \cdot (\alpha + 1)$. □

Remark 62. Note that we do not restrict the partial orders in the previous lemma to those without infinite chain. Recall that in the case of forest the erank counts the nesting of infinite branching in the tree. This intuition still holds for partial orders without infinite chain. In contrast, the ordinal $\omega + 1$ has erank 1 and the ordinal $\omega \cdot 2$ has erank 2 even though there is no branching in the sense of the existence of incomparable elements.

We aim at proving the following two lemmas.

Lemma 63. *Let $\mathfrak{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a string-automatic well-founded partial order without infinite chains. Then there is a string-automatic well-founded partial order $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}$ without infinite chains such that*

$$\mathsf{erank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \mathsf{rank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}).$$

Lemma 64. *Let $\mathfrak{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a string-automatic well-founded partial order without infinite chains. Then there is a string-automatic well-founded partial order $\hat{\mathfrak{P}} = (\hat{P}, \preceq)$ without infinite chains that*

$$\mathsf{erank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathsf{rank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}).$$

By induction we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 65. *For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a string-automatic well-founded partial order $\mathfrak{P}_i$ without infinite chains such that* $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}_i) \geq \omega^i$ *and* $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}_i) \geq \omega^{i+1}$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{P}_0$ be the disjoint union of finite chains of arbitrary length. This is a string-automatic well-founded partial order without infinite chains. Moreover, $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}_0) = 1 = \omega^0$ and $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}_0) = \omega = \omega^1$.

For the induction step, assume that $\mathfrak{P}_i$ is a string-automatic well-founded partial order without infinite chains such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}_i) \geq \omega^i$ and $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}_i) \geq \omega^{i+1}$. An application of Lemma 63 yields a string-automatic partial order $\mathfrak{P}'$ without infinite chains such that

$$\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}') = \mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}') = \mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}_i) \geq \omega^{i+1}.$$

Finally, an application of Lemma 64 to $\mathfrak{P}'$ yields a string-automatic partial order $\mathfrak{P}_{i+1}$ without infinite chains such that $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}_{i+1}) \geq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}') \geq \omega^{i+1}$ and $\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}_{i+1}) \geq \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}') \geq \omega^{i+2}$.

Recall that for every string-automatic well-founded partial order the rank is strictly below ω^ω. Corollary 65 shows that restricting to partial orders without infinite chains does not lead to a class of simpler orders with respect to the occurring ranks. Let us now prove the lemmas.

Proof of Lemma 63. The basic idea is that we make infinitely many copies of the order $\mathfrak{P} = (P, \leq)$ where we order all copies in parallel, i.e., two elements p, p' from distinct copies of P are comparable iff they were comparable in the original $\mathfrak{P}$.

In order to avoid offests of $+1$ between ranks and eranks, we have to be a bit careful. Thus, as a preliminary step, we replace $\mathfrak{P}$ by an order $\mathfrak{P}'$ of the same rank such that $\mathfrak{P}'$ has a global maximal element p_{max}. We then apply the the basic idea to the structure $\mathfrak{P}' \setminus \{p_{\mathsf{max}}\}$ and add p_{max} as global maximal element again. The resulting structure $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}$ satisfies the lemma.

Note that since ω does not embed into $\mathfrak{P}$, for each $p \in P$ there is a (local) maximal element $p' \geq p$ in P, i.e., there is no element $p'' > p'$ in P. Let $M \subseteq P$ be the set of local maximal elements of $\mathfrak{P}$. Let $\mathfrak{P}' = (P \setminus M \cup \{p_{\mathsf{max}}\}, \leq)$ be the partial order obtained from $\mathfrak{P}$ by removing all maximal elements and adding a new global maximal element p_{max}. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}') &= \mathsf{rank}(p_{\mathsf{max}}, \mathfrak{P}') \\
&= \sup\{\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) + 1 \mid p \in P \setminus M\} \\
&= \sup\left\{\sup\{\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) + 1 \mid p < p_m\} \mid p_m \in M\right\} \\
&= \sup\{\mathsf{rank}(p_m, \mathfrak{P}) \mid p_m \in M\} \\
&= \mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{P} = \{p_{\mathsf{max}}\} \cup (P \setminus M) \times \mathbb{N}$. For all $p_1, p_2 \in P$, $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $(p_1, n_1) \prec (p_2, n_2)$ if and only if $p_1 < p_2$ in $\mathfrak{P}'$. Moreover, let $p \prec p_{\mathsf{max}}$ for all $p \in (P \setminus M) \times \mathbb{N}$.

It is clear that $\hat{\mathfrak{P}} = (\hat{P}, \preceq)$ (where $\preceq\, = \,\prec \cup \{(x, x) \mid x \in \hat{P}\}$) is a string-automatic partial order, because

- the set of maximal elements M of $\mathfrak{P}$ and its complement $P \setminus M$ are regular sets,
- $(\hat{P} \setminus \{p_{\mathsf{max}}\}, \prec)$ is the product of the string-automatic structure $(P \setminus M, <)$ and the string-automatic infinite clique $(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N})$, and
- adding a maximal element to a partial order preserves string-automaticity.

Moreover, $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}$ does not contain an infinite chain because any infinite chain in $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}$ would induce an infinite chain in $\mathfrak{P}$ if the elements were projected to their first components (an infinite chain in $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}$ cannot contain the maximal element p_{max} because the chain would stop at this point!).

By induction, one sees easily that for all $p \in P \setminus M$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}')$. We conclude immediately that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{rank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) &= \mathsf{rank}(p_{\mathsf{max}}, \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \\
&= \sup\{\mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) + 1 \mid (p, n) \in (P \setminus M) \times \mathbb{N}\} \\
&= \sup\{\mathsf{rank}(p, \mathfrak{P}') + 1 \mid p \in P \setminus M\} \\
&= \mathsf{rank}(p_{\mathsf{max}}, \mathfrak{P}') \\
&= \mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}') \\
&= \mathsf{rank}(\mathfrak{P}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us finally prove $\mathsf{erank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \mathsf{rank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}})$. By induction on $\mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}})$ we prove $\mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \mathsf{erank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}})$. If $\mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = 0$, then (p, n) is minimal in $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}$ and hence $\mathsf{erank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = 0 = \mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}})$. Now assume that for some ordinal $\alpha > 0$ and all $(p, n) \in \hat{P}$ with $\mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) < \alpha$ we have $\mathsf{erank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}})$. Let $(p, n) \in \hat{P}$ such that $\mathsf{rank}((p, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \alpha$. This implies that for all $(p', n') \in \hat{P}$ with $(p', n') \prec (p, n)$,

$$\mathsf{rank}\left((p', n'), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}\right) < \alpha \text{ and}$$
$$\sup\left\{\mathsf{rank}((p', n'), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) + 1 \mid (p', n') \prec (p, n)\right\} = \alpha.$$

Recall that $\mathsf{rank}((p',n'),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \mathsf{rank}(p,\mathfrak{P})$. Thus, every rank occurring below (p,n) occurs infinitely often. Hence, we get

$$\alpha = \sup\{\beta+1 \mid \exists^\infty (p',n') \in \hat{P} : (p',n') \prec (p,n) \text{ and } \mathsf{rank}((p',n'),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \beta\}$$

which is by induction hypothesis equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= \sup\{\beta+1 \mid \exists^\infty (p',n') : (p',n') \prec (p,n) \text{ and } \mathsf{erank}((p',n'),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \beta\}\\ &= \sup\{\beta+1 \mid \exists^\infty (p',n') : (p',n') \prec (p,n) \text{ and } \mathsf{erank}((p',n'),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \beta\}.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that, $\mathsf{erank}((p,n),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \alpha = \mathsf{rank}((p,n),\hat{\mathfrak{P}})$. Thus, if a node from $\hat{P} \setminus \{p_{\mathsf{max}}\}$ has erank α in $\hat{P}$ then its infinitely many copies have rank and erank α. We therefore get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{erank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) &= \mathsf{erank}(p_{\mathsf{max}},\hat{\mathfrak{P}})\\ &= \sup\{\alpha+1 \mid \exists^\infty (p,n) \prec p_{\mathsf{max}} : \mathsf{erank}((p,n),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \alpha\}\\ &= \sup\{\alpha+1 \mid \exists (p,n) \prec p_{\mathsf{max}} : \mathsf{rank}((p,n),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \alpha\}\\ &= \sup\{\alpha+1 \mid \exists (p,n) \prec p_{\mathsf{max}} : \mathsf{rank}((p,n),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) = \alpha\}\\ &= \mathsf{rank}(p_{\mathsf{max}},\hat{\mathfrak{P}})\\ &= \mathsf{rank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}).\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Lemma 64. The idea is as follows. Take $p, p' \in P$ where one is a direct successor of the other. Put between p and p' pairwise incomparable chains of length n for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\hat{P} = P \cup \{(p,k,l) : p \in P, k,l \in \mathbb{N}, l \leq k\}$. For $\bar{p}, \bar{p}' \in \hat{P}$ set $\bar{p} \preceq \bar{p}'$ if and only if

1. $\bar{p}, \bar{p}' \in P$ and $\bar{p} \leq \bar{p}'$,
2. $\bar{p} \in P, \bar{p}' = (p',k,l)$ and $\bar{p} \leq p'$,
3. $\bar{p} = (p,k,l), \bar{p}' \in P$ and $p < \bar{p}'$, or
4. $\bar{p} = (p,k,l), \bar{p}' = (p',k',l')$ and either $p < p'$ or $p = p'$, $k = k'$ and $l \leq l'$.

Then $\hat{\mathfrak{P}} = (\hat{P}, \preceq)$ is easily shown to be a string-automatic well-founded partial order. The partial order does not contain an infinite chain: Note that there are only finite chains where each element is of the form (p,k,l) for fixed p and arbitrary k and l. Thus, if there were an infinite chain in $\hat{\mathfrak{P}}$, the projection of each element to its first component would give an infinite chain in $\mathfrak{P}$.

Since $\mathfrak{P} = \hat{\mathfrak{P}} \restriction_P$, we get $\mathsf{erank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P})$. Next, we prove by induction on $\mathsf{erank}(p,\mathfrak{P})$ that $\mathsf{rank}(p,\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(p,\mathfrak{P})$. If $p \in P$ is a node such that $\mathsf{erank}(p,\mathfrak{P}) = 0$ then $\mathsf{rank}(p,\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq 0 = \omega \cdot 0$. Now assume that for some ordinal α and all $p \in P$ with $\mathsf{erank}(p,\mathfrak{P}) = \beta < \alpha$ we have $\mathsf{rank}(p,\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \beta$. Let $p \in P$ be such that $\mathsf{erank}(p,\mathfrak{P}) = \alpha$. We make the following case distinction.

Case 1. α is a successor ordinal. Then there is some node $p' \in P$ with $p' < p$ and $\mathsf{erank}(p',\mathfrak{P})+1 = \alpha$. By induction hypothesis $\mathsf{rank}(p',\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(p',\mathfrak{P})$. We conclude immediately that

$$\mathsf{rank}((p',n,n),\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(p',\mathfrak{P}) + n$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $(p',n,n) \prec p$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we conclude that

$$\mathsf{rank}(p,\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(p',\mathfrak{P}) + \omega = \omega \cdot \alpha.$$

Case 2. α is a limit ordinal. Then there is a sequence $(p_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $p_i < p$, $\sup\{\mathsf{erank}(p_i,\mathfrak{P})\} = \alpha$, and $\mathsf{erank}(p_i,\mathfrak{P}) < \alpha$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus,

$$\mathsf{rank}(p,\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \overset{\text{Ind}}{\geq} \sup\{\mathsf{rank}(p_i,\hat{\mathfrak{P}})\} \geq \sup\{\omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(p_i,\mathfrak{P})\} > \omega \cdot \beta$$

for each $\beta < \alpha$. But this implies $\mathsf{rank}(p,\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \alpha$.

From these observations, we directly conclude that $\mathsf{rank}((p, n, n), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) + n$ for all $p \in P$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We conclude by the following case distinction.

Case 1. $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P})$ is a successor ordinal $\alpha + 1$. Hence, there is a node $p \in P$ with $\mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) = \alpha$. We conclude that $\mathsf{rank}((p, k, k), \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \alpha + k$. Thus,

$$\mathsf{rank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \sup\{\omega \cdot \alpha + k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\} = \omega \cdot \alpha + \omega = \omega \cdot (\alpha + 1) = \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}).$$

Case 2. $\mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P})$ is a limit ordinal α. Hence, for each $\beta < \alpha$ there is a $p \in P$ such that $\mathsf{erank}(p, \mathfrak{P}) \geq \beta$. Thus, $\mathsf{rank}(p, \hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \omega \cdot \beta$. But then

$$\mathsf{rank}(\hat{\mathfrak{P}}) \geq \sup\{\omega \cdot \beta \mid \beta < \alpha\} \geq \omega \cdot \alpha = \omega \cdot \mathsf{erank}(\mathfrak{P}).$$

This concludes the proof of Lemma 64. $\square$